

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. XI.—NOVEMBER, 1879.

SOME WORDS REGARDING THE HYPOTHESIS
OF KUENEN.

NOTHING is more characteristic of the thought of the present day, than the extent to which it is ruled by the idea of development or evolution. This idea is the originative principle of the vast intellectual movement which has given rise, in recent times, to comparative anatomy and comparative physiology in physical science, to comparative philology in linguistic science, comparative psychology in mental science, comparative politics in social science, and comparative theology in religious science. It is impossible to trace the influence which it is exerting in every department of research and life, without perceiving that the world is far more powerfully swayed by ideas than is commonly believed. Notwithstanding many appearances to the contrary, great general ideas will be found to be the mightiest of all social forces.

The idea of development, while modifying theology throughout its whole extent, is acting with special power on the direct and immediate study of the Bible. We owe to it a host of problems and theories,—of generalisations, good and bad,—of illusory promises and satisfactory results. It may safely be said that there is not an erroneous hypothesis regarding the Bible, now popular, which is not a part, or application, or consequence of an erroneous theory of development; and that no greater service could be rendered to the cause of Biblical science, than an adequate exhibition of the true theory of development in revelation. But the one true theory will only be reached by the refutation of many which are false; and this will only be effected by strictly testing all theories by the facts which they ought to explain.

In this paper, I purpose considering merely whether or not one very prevalent theory of the development of the Hebrew religion stands the test of one definite fact. The theory of development to which I refer is that which has its best known expositor in Professor Kuenen of Leyden. The thoroughly naturalistic character of this theory—its seeming self-

(CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.)

consistency—the elaborate ingenuity which it displays—the eminence, as scholars, of some of its defenders—the wide and warm reception which it has received—and the difficulty of satisfactorily meeting it at many points—are all reasons for subjecting it to a close scrutiny. The last of these reasons—the difficulty of refutation—is by no means the least. It arises chiefly from the difficulty of finding facts from which both the advocates and the opponents of the theory will agree to reason; and this, again, has its source in the free manipulation to which the advocates of the theory subject what are stated as facts in the Bible. The theory is not based on the statements of the Bible, but on what are maintained to be the facts out of which these statements have been evolved; and the so-called facts are obtained by a process which, although professedly a scrupulous and impartial investigation, undoubtedly assumes the truth of the principles and views which constitute the theory itself. In a word, the theory is based on so-called “facts,” which can only be established by means of the theory. The theory proves the facts, and the facts prove the theory. When the theory is assailed, the facts are alleged to be, not what they are commonly supposed, but just those which are fitted to prove it; and when the so-called facts are assailed, the principles and process of defence adopted are just those which necessarily imply that the facts must be of the nature alleged.

In examining a theory which is mainly constructed by circular reasoning of this kind, even the smallest concessions that any statements of the Bible are, in whole or in part, what they profess to be, become of importance. Now, we have such a concession in the admission that the “ten words,” commonly called the “ten commandments,” are, in the main, really Mosaic; and it may not be unprofitable to inquire how Kuenen’s theory stands related to even the “first table” of the Sinaitic law. Throughout the examination, we must, of course, remember that Kuenen’s admission is merely that “the ten words” have a “genuinely Mosaic kernel”—not that they are “literally authentic.”

For the one purpose in view, it obviously matters little what is the correct method of dividing the Decalogue, and, therefore, we shall adopt that with which we are most familiar, especially as Kuenen’s division seems to be much inferior to it.

“I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods in my presence.” These words could only have been addressed to a people who had been so specially and signally delivered from Egyptian bondage, and who had afterwards been so guarded and guided, that they believed themselves to be bound to God as no other people was. They are unintelligible if there was not, immediately behind them, a very wondrous history which had impressed the minds of those to whom they were addressed, as miraculous. They presuppose belief in some such events as, we are told, preceded and followed the Exodus. If Moses published these words to the Israelites,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

we must accept, as substantially true, the nineteen chapters which tell how the children of Israel were brought out of Egypt unto Sinai. But we must accept much more. For, the words teach an exclusive monotheism. The God who claims the homage of Israel demands an undivided service,—lays down, as the first principle of the universal law of religious and moral duty, that He alone is to be honoured as God.

It is impossible for Kuenen and his followers to accept this fact in its entirety, and, consequently, they endeavour to explain much of it away. "Moses," says Knappert, faithfully summarising Kuenen's teaching, "not only preached Yahveh as the God of Israel, but he wished the tribes to worship this god in contrast to, and to the exclusion of, all other gods. But we do not by any means intend to assert that Moses was a Monotheist, or that he supposed Yahveh to be absolutely the only god, and the other gods not to exist at all. Such pure monotheism as that belongs to much later days. It was not till many centuries after the time of Moses, that the prophets attained to so lofty a conception. Moses himself believed in the existence of other gods, just as much as in that of Yahveh; but he taught that Yahveh was the only one to whom the Israelites ought to pray. He was profoundly impressed with Yahveh's majesty and power. Yahveh only was Israel's god. We find this principle expressed in the phrase of the law, 'Ye shall have no other gods before me.' " *

It is strange that it should not have occurred to Kuenen, and the other writers who maintain the view just stated, that they would be expected to produce some instances of polytheists who imagined that they were bound to worship only one God,—that only one God had a right to the worship of all other gods. The reasonableness of the expectation is so obvious, that one has to seek for an explanation of the fact that the acute critics of the new school of Leyden have failed to see it. May the explanation not be,—a vague consciousness that instances of the kind required would be very difficult to find? I venture to affirm that there are none to be found. Polytheists are foolish enough, but they are not wholly devoid of reason; and although they have believed in tutelary, tribal, and national gods, they have never fancied that it could be the greatest of all offences,—the very root of an irreligious and immoral life,—to worship more gods than one. And yet this fancy, so absurd as to be unknown even in the history of heathen error, is actually supposed, by Kuenen and others, to have been a fundamental principle in the faith of a man like Moses. That "Moses himself believed in the existence of other gods just as much as in that of Yahveh, but taught that Yahveh was the only one to whom the Israelites ought to pray," is psychologically improbable in the extreme. Critics who make it an axiom to disbelieve in physical miracles should not expect their readers to believe, without proof, in psychological miracles.

The first commandment implies, then, that there is but one God.

* "The Religion of Israel," pp. 36, 37.

But how can we account for Moses teaching, and the Israelites receiving this truth? Kuenen would have us to believe that the religion of the Israelites was originally fetichism; and that, out of this fetichism, there slowly grew nature-worship, and out of nature-worship, a belief in a national god, which belief, finally, long after the days of Moses, developed into belief in one God. Well, this is an *hypothesis* as to the course through which the religion of the Israelites passed,—a substitute for a history of their religion by one who believes that the materials for a history itself are wanting. But an hypothesis as to the course of development through which a religion has passed, is not an hypothesis as to why it passed through that course, and much less an actual explanation of why it did so. Yet, manifestly, what is required of Kuenen is, not merely an hypothesis as to the course of the history of the religion of Israel, but an indication of the causes capable of accounting for its course being the one alleged,—a course leading to belief in the unity of God. How came it to pass that the Israelites alone, of all nations, rose above fetichism, nature-worship, and every kind of polytheism, to a sublime and self-consistent monotheism? The fact is a unique phenomenon in history, and, in every respect, deserves and demands not only to be stated, but explained. Clearly, it is not explained by simply asserting that it took place. If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were historical personages,—if special revelations were made to them,—if tradition preserved their memories,—if, in a word, the Book of Genesis be substantially true,—it is explained. Kuenen, however, sweeps all that away, denies that there is any history in Genesis, and fills up the blank, which the denial produces, with the hypothesis to which reference has just been made. By so doing, he seems to make the faith of Moses hopelessly unintelligible, and obviously becomes bound to provide another explanation of it than that which he has rejected. In the way of such explanation, however, he has not even an hypothesis to present. He makes no serious attempt to show why a conception of deity, little different from that which the Canaanites and Phœnicians had of Molech should have been developed, among the Israelites, into the idea of Jehovah.

The second commandment is a prohibition of image-worship. "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, or any likeness of what is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations of those that hate me, and showing mercy to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments." This commandment, of course, does not at all fit into Professor Kuenen's hypothesis. If promulgated by Moses, it directly contradicts the hypothesis. This being the case, it may seem to many persons that the hypothesis should be either rejected or revised and modified. Professor Kuenen prefers to alter and colour the fact,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

until it suits the hypothesis. He tells us that the commandment under consideration must be regarded as an elaboration of the first commandment, and of later date. It seems to me manifestly not an elaboration of the first commandment, and of contemporary date. The first commandment forbids the worship of any other being than Jehovah, and the second forbids the worship of any visible object, even although it may be regarded as an image or symbol of Jehovah. The one commandment is distinct from the other ; but each supplements and implies the other. Professor Kuenen's conjecture, it is also obvious to remark, assumes that some one ventured to tamper, in a very audacious manner, with the fundamental and most sacred law of the Jewish theocracy ; and that this bold and unconscientious person had influence enough to get his "elaboration" universally accepted, as the Word of God spoken to Moses. Are these not two very improbable assumptions ? They are certainly quite gratuitous assumptions. Professor Kuenen tells us that "it is difficult to answer the question what Moses thought about the worship of images, and what was his attitude towards bull-worship." Perhaps it may be difficult for Professor Kuenen to answer it ; but an easier question in itself there cannot be. If we do not know what Moses thought about image-worship and bull-worship, we know nothing whatever about Moses.

How much the clear proclamation of the second commandment was needed by the Israelites, was shown by their worship of the calf at Sinai itself, and their frequent lapses into idolatry, both in the wilderness and in Palestine. The idolatry of the Israelites is the chief reason assigned by Kuenen, and by all writers of the school to which he belongs, for denying the monotheism of Moses. They argue that it is inconceivable that a nation, after once attaining to pure monotheism, should again and again fall back into polytheism ; that no one who believes there is but one sole God can deliberately serve other gods. But it is a weak argument. So far from there being anything inconceivable in a falling away from monotheism to polytheism, it is only with difficulty that a large class of minds can be kept from such apostacy,—witness, for example, the process of deification of the Virgin Mary going on, in our own day, in Roman Catholic Spain and Austria. No monotheism of mere reason could maintain itself in existence among the uneducated. Besides, who holds that the people of Israel under Moses were all pure monotheists ? Moses taught monotheism as revealed truth ; but the people of Israel were unable to appreciate his teaching for centuries later, and were undeterred, even by the view which he represented God as giving of His holiness and jealousy, from worshipping the gods whom they had learned to serve in Egypt, or derived from the peoples around them.

The reason given in the second commandment for the prohibition of image-worship is the Divine jealousy ; and this Divine jealousy is described as displaying itself in punishing the iniquity of apostacy from God, and in showing mercy to those who love Him and keep His

commandments. The Divine jealousy is often made prominent in Scripture ; but it always signifies, as here, what has been called "the energy of Divine holiness, exhibiting itself as wrath towards those who dishonour God and violate His laws, and as kindness towards those who reverence and obey Him." There is nothing capricious in it ; for, what occasions it is always, on the one hand, impiety and sin, and, on the other, piety and righteousness. Nor does it manifest itself fitfully and uncertainly, but continuously and surely ; for, those who turn away from God to idolatry bring down, in the way both of natural and judicial consequence, not only upon themselves, but upon coming generations, degradation and misery ; while those who heartily turn to Him, and faithfully serve Him, secure blessings for thousands after them. A jealousy which is thus but holiness in manifestation—which is but zeal for sanctity, and zeal against impiety—cannot, in the least, warrant the identification of Jehovah with Molech, which Kuenen, following Vatke and Daumer, attempts to establish.

For a summary of the reasoning by which he reaches his conclusion I may again have recourse to Knappert. "The national god of the Israelites was, in early times, regarded as a god of light and fire, who was to be greatly feared, and was propitiated by human sacrifices. He was originally closely allied in character with the Canaanitish or Phœnician Molech. Hence, he was worshipped in the likeness of a bull, as an emblem of the power of the sun, so mighty to destroy. Thus Molech, too, was represented with a bull's head ; and a bull's horns were always given to Astarte. With this, also, are connected the bull's horns which we find on Yahveh's altar in later times, and the twelve oxen which support the molten sea. The cherubs, too, on which Yahveh sits, are of Phœnician origin, and represent the heavy thunder-clouds which hide the Thunderer from the eyes of men. The representations of flowers and fruits which Solomon put in the temple are, in the same way, symbols of the life of nature as awakened by the sun-god. Moreover, by the side of Yahveh's altar, we have what are called 'asheras,' which are lopped stems of trees, and symbols of the goddess Ashera, the female side of the beneficent sun-god ; and 'chamanim,' or sun-images, which represent the rays of the sun in the shape of a cone. All this shows that Israel's god was originally regarded as a god of light and fire, and differed little or nothing in character from the rest of the gods of the Semites. But in the conception of Yahveh, as the stern and terrible god, lay the germ of the higher conception which afterwards grew out of it."*

A brief answer will suffice. There is no evidence that the God of Israel was ever regarded as a god of light and fire. There is evidence only that light was regarded as a symbol of His power to enlighten the mind, and fire as a symbol of His wrath against sin. There is no evidence that the God of Israel was ever propitiated by human sacrifices. To adduce, as

* "The Religion of Israel," pp. 29, 30.

proof, the trial of Abraham's faith, and the words in Micah, "Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" shows merely that real proof is not to be had. The statement that the God of Israel was originally closely allied with the Canaanitish or Phœnician Molech is another unproved assertion. If, however, the conception of a god as "stern and terrible" was a "germ" sufficient to produce the conception of a God of holiness and mercy, the conception of Molech should certainly have made the religion of the Canaanites and Phœnicians wonderfully different from anything it ever became. The worship of Molech is, throughout the Old Testament, condemned with special severity, because it was specially cruel and unnatural. Here is a sample of the way in which it is referred to—"The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Again, thou shalt say to the children of Israel, Whosoever he be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel, that giveth any of his seed unto Molech, he shall surely be put unto death: the people of the land shall stone him with stones. And I will set my face against that man, and will cut him off from among his people; because he hath given of his seed unto Molech, to defile my sanctuary, and to profane my holy name. And if the people of the land do any ways hide their eyes from the man, when he giveth of his seed unto Molech, and kill him not; then will I set my face against that man, and against his family, and will cut him off, and all that go a whoring after him, to commit whoredom with Molech, from among their people" (Lev. xx. 1-5). This is the only kind of relationship between Jehovah and Molech of which we read anywhere in the Old Testament. It can hardly, I think, be appropriately described as a "close alliance." To represent, as the real foundation of the worship of Jehovah, what the Old Testament uniformly thus condemns, is arbitrary in the extreme. The combination of the worship of Jehovah with bull-worship was introduced ages after the publication of the Ten Commandments, and in plain violation, both of the first and second commandments; but as the bull was not a symbol of Molech only, but of many other gods, and a symbol of strength in general, bull-worship, bulls' heads, and bulls' horns can afford no argument for confounding Jehovah and Molech. The argument on which Kuenen dwells most—that which is drawn from the ornamentation of Solomon's temple—is one without relevancy. No visible object in Solomon's temple was an object of worship; no object there implied a violation of the second commandment; the objects mentioned by Kuenen were employed either simply for ornamentation, or for ornamentation combined, to some extent, with symbolisation. What the origin of the ornament or symbol was, and what its history was, could be of little consequence. By proving any, or all of them, to have come from a heathen source, not even a single step is taken towards the conclusion that Jewish worship had been evolved out of heathen beliefs. The argument of Kuenen is not one whit better than would be the inference, that the doctrine taught in a

Presbyterian church was originally and substantially pagan, because the weathercock on the church-steeple, the carving on the pulpit, or the ornamentation of the church-stove might be traced back to pagan conceptions. Oxen, bulls' heads, and bulls' horns symbolised strength; asheras and chamanim symbolised wisdom and illumination; and cherubs, mystery—all equally well, no matter what their ultimate origin was; and an inquiry into their origin can throw no light on the origin of the idea of the Deity, some of whose characteristics, however, they may suffice to indicate.

The third commandment forbids the abuse and dishonour of the name of God—its employment in irreverence or for falsehood. It is a declaration that God will not have His name uttered in a light or impious manner, and will not hold guiltless any one who attempts to gain credit to a falsehood by an appeal to Him. It supposes that holiness and truth are the essential principles of God's nature, and that no manifestation of His can be other than holy and true. This, as we have seen, is also implied in the previous commandment; and the whole second table of the law is proof that the conception of God possessed by Moses was profoundly ethical. Moses, it is manifest, had a distinct view of God as possessed of moral attributes—as the holy, the righteous, the jealous, the merciful God.

But must God not have been known in a simpler, more superficial, and less abstract and reflective manner by those who knew him first? Must there not have been an older monotheism than that of Moses? Kuenen answers, "No," but obviously without having put the question to himself clearly and carefully; while, in the Book of Genesis, there is an affirmative answer given of a kind which bears witness to its own truth and to the essential trustworthiness of the record which contains it. No moral attributes are predicated of God, in the accounts of His self-manifestations to primeval and patriarchal man. In the earlier stages of revelation, these attributes are never even named. It is only *moral actions* which are ascribed to God, in the representations given of His earliest dealings with mankind. In the very front of the Biblical records, God is set before us as creating the world in an orderly, graduated way, and making it "very good"; as trying the obedience of Adam and Eve, and punishing their sin; as judging Cain; as sweeping away the wicked by a deluge, &c.; but God is nowhere in the Pentateuch described as the wise one, while the ascription to Him of purely moral attributes dates only from the time of Moses. Just as a child learns to know the principles and affections of its father through many single acts, so the human race is represented in the Bible as having gradually learned to know God's attributes through being shewn His works. It is a characteristic of Scripture that it thus represents God as manifesting Himself to men first and directly by His *acts*—by what they can immediately and easily see and apprehend, in order thus to raise them gradually and surely to a knowledge of the *essential properties* of His

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

nature. But Kuenen has overlooked this characteristic, and formed an hypothesis utterly inconsistent with it. The characteristic, however, is an indubitable fact, and any hypothesis inconsistent with it must be rejected.

The fourth commandment, also, is inexplicable on the hypothesis of Kuenen. According to that hypothesis, the account of the creation in Genesis was written long after the time of Moses. But here, in the fourth commandment, the reason for setting apart the seventh day, as the Sabbath, distinctly implies the truth of the so-called Mosaic account. The words, "For, in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day : wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it," sum up everything in that account which Kuenen cannot admit. They teach a strict monotheism ; they have no room for any God but Jehovah ; they tell the Israelites that their God is He to whom belong heaven, earth, and sea, and all that dwell therein. Kuenen is, therefore, obliged to suppose that the latter part of the commandment was added after the composition of the account of creation in Genesis, centuries after the time of Moses. The words will not square with his hypothesis, and consequently, they must go. For the supposition that they are a late addition, there is no valid reason. It is true that they are not to be found in the version of the commandment which appears in Deuteronomy ; but, in the first place, the version in Exodus ought, according to Kuenen's own views, to be older than that in Deuteronomy ; and, in the second place, it is more probable that both versions are to be referred to Moses than to two other distinct authors. If an injunction to set apart the seventh day, as a Sabbath to the Lord, were given at all, a reason for it must surely also have been given. It is incredible, in such a case, that the injunction should have been unaccompanied by a reason. It also deserves to be noticed that the 90th Psalm, which many very advanced critics assign to Moses, likewise contains the truth which Kuenen cannot afford to acknowledge as possibly known to the lawgiver. "Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God." But, probably, a still more decisive consideration is, that the discoveries at Kouyounjiik have brought to light the fragments of an account of creation, which, although strikingly similar to that in Genesis, can hardly date from less than six centuries before Moses. In that account, we read regarding the God of heaven that—

"In the centre He placed luminaries.
The moon He appointed to rule the night,
And to wander through the night, until the dawn of day.
Every month without fail He made holy assembly-days.
On the seventh day He appointed a holy day,
And to cease from all work He commanded." *

* "Records of the Past," ix. 117.

If these words were written six centuries before Moses, why must either the words in Gen. ii. 2-3, or those which Kuenen would exclude from the fourth commandment, have been written centuries after Moses?

The works of Professor Kuenen are learned and ingenious; they cannot fail to promote, directly and indirectly, the cause of Biblical study; but the general hypothesis on which they proceed must give place to a theory of the development of religion, more rational than any which rationalism can invent, and broad enough to include special revelation.

R. FLINT.

THE UNCHANGEABLENESS OF THE APOSTOLIC GOSPEL.*

I HAVE received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, on the night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and after he had blessed it, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you. In like manner, also, the cup, and said, This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (1 Cor. xi. 23-25). We proceed, with good reason, from this holy institution, to establish our right to speak of the "apostolic Gospel," not as of a doctrine of the apostles, different from the teaching of Christ, and also not as of a Gospel of one apostle differing from the others. We find them all gathered around this Table—this Testament had they all received, Paul not excepted, from the Lord. The Holy Supper comes, indeed, to be considered by us *here* only, as an authentic testimony as to how the Lord Himself would have His death regarded. But that He should have embodied His precious doctrine in the form of such a transaction is a wondrous trait of His wisdom and love. The disciples had never understood it, when He would speak to them of the sufferings and death that lay

* In our account of the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance at Basle, an account was given of the remarkable address of Professor Von Orelli, of Basle (see pp. 229-301). We have now the pleasure of publishing a translation of the paper itself. It may be well here to repeat the theses which Professor Von Orelli undertook in his argument to prove—(1.) The Gospel in which the apostles, according to the teaching of their Master, proclaimed a Divine salvation to the world, has for its basis the atoning death and resurrection of the Lord; the first as the accomplishment, the second as the pledge of salvation. (2.) The Christian doctrine of all ages is attached to these two historical ideas as its needful foundation. These cannot be detached without denying its true essence and depriving it of its blessed efficacy. (3.) The apostolic Gospel has proved its saving efficacy in all times, among all races, to all nations, to every class of culture. (4.) The same Gospel alone responds to the deepest needs of the present, and is alone able to solve the greatest problems of the future.

Those who heard Professor Von Orelli's address may possibly notice that it has been slightly abbreviated. It is translated from the MS. sent by Professor Von Orelli himself. In transmitting it, he writes: "I give it in somewhat shorter extent, but without leaving out any essential thought."—J. E. C.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

before Him ; they shrank back as often as He thought to introduce them into this holiest. Thus He had then, in the parting hour, handed over to them this record, not to be lost,—indestructible, unmistakable. So soon as the Spirit came on them, they necessarily found in it that which they had to proclaim to the world ; and until He come again, this memorial will remain, and wherever a spark of His Spirit moves, one will read in it what Paul, Peter, John preached with one accord—the Testament of Christ, the apostolic Gospel.

“My body broken for you,” “the new covenant in my blood.” What the Lord would say thereby to His disciples is not doubtful to him who knows the holy institutes of the old covenant. Jesus thus most clearly presented Himself as the sacrificial Lamb whose death would make possible the closing of the New Covenant, whose blood must flow for the cleansing of believers from the guilt of sin, and to accomplish their union with God. Take, eat ; drink ye all of it. The Lord, in thus making meat of His body, and drink of His blood, testified that He imparts a new life to humanity by His atoning death, a holy, divine life, which is not subject to death. But, that this life, which Jesus bore in Himself and brought to us, really overcomes death, has become manifest to us by His resurrection from the dead. This event has been first to us the pledge of the truth of His Word, and of the working of His death. The salvation promised by Christ has, by His resurrection, become a reality, from which the apostles could proclaim a message, a joyous message, the Gospel.

These two inseparable facts, the atoning death and the resurrection from the dead, are, then, the foundations of the apostolic preaching, the two pillars on which they built the Church. Paul names, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, as the sum and substance of his teaching and working, Jesus, the Crucified One. And he writes to the same community, “Has Christ not risen ? Then is our preaching vain, empty, without object.” He grasps both together in the Epistle to the Romans, Jesus Christ delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification. So is it with the other apostles. In place of adducing the testimony of them all, let us only recall him who has been charged with bitter hostility to the Pauline Gospel. What does John see in the Apocalypse as the middle point of heaven and earth, of the kingdom of God, and of the history of the world ? The Lamb that was slain for the salvation of men, to whom henceforth the world is subject. All the saints before the throne are, according to John, those only who have washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb, who was dead and is alive, and has the power over death, and the kingdom of death. This is not merely the Pauline ; it is the apostolic Gospel.

Such a message stands in quite a different relation to that in which one haply discovers a truth ; as, for instance, a law of nature, which had ever its force, but is for the first time recognised ; or of some force of nature ever existing, but now made use of in some new manner. Such

a discovery or invention becomes necessarily the common possession of men, so soon as it is known. Every one can verify it, and turn it to use. He does not even require to know the discoverer, or how he came to the discovery. The worth of the discovery is independent of the person of him to whom we owe it. But it was not such a universal truth Christ discovered. Reconciliation with God has, through His death, first become a truth. It is not merely that the conception of God by man has become quite changed by His teaching, but the relation of God to humanity is itself quite changed by His work of reconciliation, and there is obtained through His person an entirely new vital force which did not previously exist in sinful humanity. Therefore is salvation bound to Him for all time, and is founded on the historical facts of His sacrificial death and His resurrection.

In spite of this, the effort of many in our day has, for its intention, to loosen Christianity from its historical basis. The idea of reconciliation—the principle of men being the sons of God—they would hold fast to as the substance of our religion, but they would make both as independent as possible of the events in the life of Jesus. It is true that oneness with God has been represented in Him in fullest measure, and has been most signally verified in His death on the cross. He has established thus, by His absolute self-surrender, that, for him who knows himself to be at one with God, no reverse of life can be a token of the Divine displeasure. But His sufferings and death have brought no change in the relation of God to the world. God's love to men has ever been undimmed; only, men did not rightly recognise this, until Jesus showed them how they should grasp this love, and hold it fast despite all that seemed contrary to it. Thus the terms of salvation have stood fast for ever; Christ was only the benignant beginner who taught all by His example how they could be reconciled to God, and at peace with the world.

That this is a change, a *substantial* transformation, of the apostolic Gospel, we do not now need to say after what has been already stated. But we would now point to this,—that from this transformation there follows nothing short of the entire breaking up of Christianity. Certainly, we ought to name, with deep reverence, the Discoverer who discovered the richest treasures lying hidden in the human breast, and who staked His life in making these accessible to others. Only, had Jesus done nothing more than this, had He created nothing new in that Divine strength, which He alone possessed, one cannot perceive why another might not have done the same under favourable circumstances, or why, in the future, another may not accomplish the same for some other portion of humanity. It is, in this case, a preconceived opinion without foundation, that salvation can come to all men through Jesus Christ only—an opinion which has been already refuted by experience. We see, in our day, thousands of Jews and Brahmins, mounting with light step to the lauded height of the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

Divine sonship of man, and of oneness with God, who have not been taught by Christ, and would know nothing of Him. And accordingly, the most advanced thinkers already declare that it is a subordinate question for them from whom they have received this principle of oneness with God, whether from Jesus or another; they make no secret of it, that this idea is present, indeed, in Biblical Christianity, but that it is very far from being found there in its perfect form. We see then, thus, that by the apostolic Gospel alone, is confession justified and demanded. "There is salvation in none other, and there is none other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved, save only the name of Jesus of Nazareth." On the other hand, by this modernised Gospel, it is a secondary question of pietism, of scientific judgment, whether one estimate somewhat higher or lower the person and work of Jesus, or pass it by altogether.

But it is objected that the Gospel loses nothing of its imperishable worth, if we detach it from the contents of these Biblical narratives, and thus spiritualise it. There are narratives whose worth and truth lie only in the idea which they represent. There runs through all the ancient world-history a wondrous legend of death and resurrection. That Osiris whom the ancient Egyptians mourn as dead, who then rises again in his son Horos, has certainly not his significance as an historical personage. But as often as the green withers beneath the burning rays of the sun; as often as, in spring, a fresh impulse makes the earth young again; as often as a generation, weak by age, descends into the grave, and a fresh, vigorous race flourishes over the graves of the past,—so often is that profound legend verified. It contains something that belongs to nature and to common humanity, and is therefore ever true again. It is true that what has not been already given to us in nature, and in the inner life, no myth can warrant for us. It can only bring to our thoughts, by lively representation, what we already possess, that to which we can attain, or what we must suffer, according to the natural course of the world. But so soon as one treats thus the histories of the Bible, and in place of laying the emphasis on the creative works of the grace of God, puts it on general ideas to which these histories serve only as an outer vesture, Christianity ceases to be anything else than that which is common to humanity, given to us and to all men, from all time, in nature and experience.

But we must now ask the representatives of this ideal Christianity, Is this idea of the Divine sonship of man truly such a common property of men that it has only to be declared, and only the right expression for it needs to be found, to assure every one of it? This idea, which they would offer as the Gospel of this day's world—suitable to the age—stands in fearful contradiction to facts—the daily experiences of our entire humanity. I name only two such facts, which lie before us as manifest, as naked, in the modern as in the ancient world. The one is an inner fact, but mighty in its working outwardly; the other is external, but

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

deeply founded in the inner. The one is *Sin*, the other is *Death*. As long as there is no success—despite the progress of science and culture—in getting rid of these two facts, the attempt is idle to save humanity from itself by ideas.

Tell the men, who know that they are separated from God by their sins, that they are sons of God. They cannot be happy as regards this neglected jewel of theirs, for they are too deeply penetrated with the holiness of God not to be assured that they are lying under His displeasure. The fact that the more a man recognises the perfect righteousness of God, the greater does the chasm appear separating him from the God of his life and salvation, and causing him to be wretched, is inconvenient enough to the mind of the modern world. They seek to cloke it in many ways. Some have spoken of Shemitic ideas as not giving the rule for the Indo-Germanic mind. The consciousness of guilt demanding expiation before a righteous God, has something Shemitic in it—it is a national Jewish idiosyncrasy. As if this testimony of the Bible had not found its mightiest re-echo, in the Roman world, in that Augustine who has so laid bare, from his own deepest experience, the ungodliness without excuse of sin, and its unhappy consequences ;—as if it was not the chief of the Church doctors of the Middle Ages, the British Anselm of Canterbury, who showed, with the greatest emphasis, the fearful weight of the least sins, not to be compensated for by the efforts of the whole world ;—as if it was not the most German of the Germans—Martin Luther—who had experienced in himself the curse of the holy law, as scarcely another since Paul the Apostle—who, through his soul-sufferings, became the reformer—"O my sins, my sins, my sins!"—as if the Church Prayer spoke not to the deepest heart of all of us which our French brother in the faith offered up to God in a momentous hour : "We acknowledge and confess that we are poor sinners, conceived and born in sin, inclined to all evil, incapable of any good, that we daily violate Thy holy commandments, and thereby draw upon ourselves death and destruction, according to Thy righteous judgment" (*Beza*).

No, the consciousness of guilt before God, and the longing after a Redeemer, cannot be thus derived from national or personal peculiarity, or from narrowness of view. It is a universal truth which one has only to bring into view to be sure of the consent of every susceptible conscience. And those men have become the greatest benefactors of humanity, in all ages, to whom has been most clearly opened up the perfect righteousness of God and their own unrighteous and corrupt estate. These shone over all nations as the brightest star, bringing many to righteousness, who have pressed on the way to the Gospel of the apostles, and have found there not an idea nor a doctrine, but a strength to save all who believe. On the other hand, it was at all times a backward step in the Christian Church—the beginning of a relapse into heathendom—to regard sin more lightly. To-day it is only possible thus for many to believe that they can reconcile themselves to God, and that they

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

need not a Mediator for it. They seek, too, to diminish the fact of the corruption of man by sin. Evil is a necessary condition which cannot be separated from the finite, imperfect creature—excusable from the want of knowledge and strength, or it is an inevitable point of transition to reach the good. In seeking thus to excuse man, the guilt is shifted to God, and redemption is rendered impossible. Or there is somehow the hope that humanity will gradually leave behind it this point of transition, and that evil will more and more decline. The preaching of this progressive sort of Gospel one might have heard, but shortly since, from the housetops. So soon as enlightenment shall have made the people thoughtful, and culture shall have led them to be susceptible of the ideal, the filthy stains will of themselves disappear. Men will love the good so soon as they rightly know it. And the beautiful, which art creates, will reconcile men, and transfigure the world. Ah! who believes now in this continual perfecting of humanity? This Gospel of some decades ago,—how it has been put to shame in our day, when the progress of culture brings with it an ever-deeper moral corruption, and the poison which goes forth from the educated classes wastes away the moral strength, and with it the very pith of the best races! If Paul knew no other way to righteousness to the Jews, true to their law, than Jesus the Crucified; and if he must present to the ideal Greeks, with their harmonious conception of the world, as the alone Reconciler, Jesus, the Crucified One—how much more is this needful in our divided and distracted age, when the old venerable pillars of good morals and order totter, and the people begin to fling from them their noblest possessions in dull greed of pleasure, and in hateful embitterment!

But as the power of *sin* is felt in our age in all its weight, so, too, is it also with that other fact we have brought forward, *death*. Does death recede before the torch of science? What has it discovered, after thousands of years, of that other side from which the little span of space and time separates us, through which we have to pass to the grave? It has discovered nothing. Or is death somewhat lightened to the society of to-day by its finer culture? He who knows the modern world is aware how unbearable the very thought of death is, how not to be confronted. It is the worm, with its continual gnawing, embittering all their joys. They know well that death has its sting, even if they do not know that this sting is sin. But it is not thus merely with the world of surface-life; the higher minds feel with a deeper pain this curse of death, which snatches away the noblest. They feel that violence is thus done to their diviner nature, that a judgment and condemnation lie in death. Yes, he who would proclaim a Gospel—a message of good news to the world of to-day, with its many plagues, with all its poor and oppressed, with its dying, and those who must die—must be armed against death, else he may spare himself the effort.

And yet it is fancied that one can do without this fact of the resurrec-

tion of Christ. Only one idea will be borrowed from this traditional history, something like this,—that the spirit-life cannot be quenched in its totality, but ever renews itself again, even if the personal continuance after death be in the highest degree doubtful. As if the Christian Easter Gospel were what one might as well take from the traditions of the gods of old Babylon and of Egypt, or from the Northern Edda. We know well that many, in the pressure of need, in the sight of the dying, or those mourning over the dead, may give more than they themselves possess. As they cannot tell of facts, they speak of presages and hopes, and reach out, with a pitying hand, a wine of myrrh to satisfy the need of the feeble mortal, and to lighten to him the heavy death-struggle. But the rigidly scientific representatives of this school have only a shrug of the shoulders for this death-cry of humanity. They have already given their sentence—what certain truth there is according to those principles according to which they have spiritualised the Gospel. A life of a finite human creature there has never been without sin and death, and there will never be. It were a self-contradiction.

How one can call this Christian teaching, we do not know ; but of this we are assured, that, so long as there stirs in man something of that Divine loftiness imprinted in creation on him, he will protest with indignation against this ignominious degradation which crushes him for ever in the dishonourable bonds of sin and death. Let the Church mark this. Unbelieving science also comes to the same conclusion. "If Christ is not arisen, then is your faith vain ; ye are yet in your sins." You are without help in the power of death. What alone can give us joyous assurance to work, in time, for eternity, is that which made the apostles so strong. The Lord is arisen. He is truly arisen. And with Peter we exclaim, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Pet. i. 3).

But I hear this objection. This Gospel contradicts too much the consciousness of our time. It cannot be received by the generation of this age. May we be allowed the inquiry—In what time, and to what world-consciousness has the Gospel been acceptable ? To the Jew, it was a stumbling-block ; to the Greek, foolishness ; thus the world first judged it. Just so it condemns it to-day. When we hear how the moralists of our time protest against this stumbling-block, that the guiltless should suffer for the guilty—when we see how the wise of our day shake their heads so soon as the resurrection of the dead is spoken of—this does not perplex us. The world is substantially not other than it was ; but the Gospel must have been fundamentally changed if it did not encounter any longer, in closest conflict, the contradiction of the natural man, proud of his virtue and his culture. The opposition it experiences to-day is itself a proof of its unchangeableness.

There is one thing we must decidedly bring here into prominence.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

We do not call theology, which has developed Biblical truth in scientific forms, unchangeable. The vessels in which she has striven at all times to contain the treasures of Divine Revelation are perishable, be they of ever so noble metal. The Confessions, too, of the individual Churches are changeable; and they are this all the more, the more theologically they have been formed. They cannot, too, in all ways, suffice for all needs; for each individual Confession brings into prominence only one portion of the Divine truth—that which seemed to the Church necessary to confess at a particular time. Each time and each people has its special gift and responsibility in the investigation of Holy Writ, and the appropriation of the salvation in Christ given for all times. But we would not confound these Confessions, worthy as they are of honour, with the foundation of our faith itself; but, as they themselves require, we would prove them by Holy Writ, complete them from it, and rectify them where there is need.

We shall rejoice, then, if, in our day, the impulse prevails among theologians to bring to light, out of the Bible itself, in its original form, the truths of salvation, by all the appliances of science, independent of official Confessions and traditional theology. But at the same time, we cannot, with all this, often avoid the feeling that, to make the Gospel acceptable to the present generation, its meaning has been explained away and arbitrarily changed. This is vain toil. True science will ever open up true Christianity with its power and loftiness, but also with its ruggedness and offence. One will have the choice between the wisdom of this world and the foolishness of the Cross.

But, still more than science,—practical life, with its great duties and severe sufferings and struggles, establishes to us ever anew the genuine Gospel. "For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men." This very age has great duties before it. The increase of the channels of commerce which connect us with the ends of the earth, in part with regions quite newly opened up, lays closely, on every friend of humanity, the duty to do something for his fellow-men who lead there an unworthy and wretched existence. That the culture which self-interest spontaneously carries thither helps them in nothing, but thoroughly tends to ruin, dark pages of the later and latest history teach us. Love only can here accomplish something; but whence is the power? Ask those who stand without, in the advanced posts of heathendom, what gives them the strength to hold their ground against all the barbarism and hostility of heathendom. It is not ideas—it is the facts of redemption, it is the compassion of Him who humbled Himself to the most unworthy, to save them. It were especially deserving of thanks, if the inner experiences of missions were gathered together by one familiar with the matter—I mean the workings of the Apostolic Gospel as observed on the various natures and characters of the individual races and peoples. Then it would be shown how the preaching of the Cross to-day still humbles the proudest, tames the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

wildest, elevates the meanest. It has been well said—"The missionaries have come to inhabitants of the earth about whom the learned seriously strove whether they were men; and these perishing creatures have become men through the Gospel of the Bible." But wherefore speak of the distant heathen and their need? In the midst of Christendom, the need becomes ever greater, the discontent ever more general, the universal situation ever more unbearable. It needs here not less love not to allow oneself to be discouraged by all the wretchedness, and by all the folly and hatred that prevail. There is only one power which is equal to this need. It is love to Him who requited all evil with good, and trust in Him who, despite His seeming defeat, was the Conqueror, and against all antagonism will establish His kingdom on the earth as in heaven. The so-called Humanitarianism which has been learned and borrowed from Christianity, but which seeks more and more to separate itself from it, shrivels up ever the more, the more earnestly it is sifted. The natural man, with his wisdom, strength, and virtue, is swept on to shipwreck.

The last ten years have been especially instructive in this respect. A few years ago, we heard the last words of Dr. Fr. Strauss, who at one period tore into fragments the Gospel history as a mixture of little truth with much fiction. He then, quite consistently, at the end abandoned the Christian name, and logically bade farewell absolutely to the God of the Bible. Providence, the righteous retribution, the life beyond, he declared to be but imagination. What did Strauss offer in substitution? The reading of Lessing, Schiller's dramas, Goethe's lyrics, the symphonies of Haydn. According to his advice, the world might edify itself by these. There are as many healing truths to be found in them, and as many golden sentences, as in the Bible itself; he could not speak of any purer bliss than that which one carries home after a good performance of the "Magic Flute." Thus teaches the man whom a whole chorus of Protestant theologians followed for decades. We are not, then, surprised that Strauss showed himself, latterly, anxiously concerned at the violent greed of the Fourth Estate, who would overthrow all the fundamental rights of property, the family, human life. Ah! yes; if one destroys the faith of men, disgusts them with their heaven, dishonours their God, then will he expel their baser passions with no golden sentences of Lessing and Goethe. Force must then be called in to help; but how long iron will avail is a different question.

But even Strauss has not spoken the last word. To the preacher of an abject earthly bliss, there have followed the preachers of the world's pain. They have reviled to his face that iron God of nature before whom Strauss would blindly bow, and in place of cravenly closing their eyes to all sorrow, they have cursed the world with all that it bears. It has been easy for them to show how worthless are all the conquests of which the new age is so proud; how untrue that is which it names Freedom, Progress, Culture. They have withdrawn the veil from the abyss of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

immorality and wretchedness, over which this world of culture is hanging. They have shown, what is fearfully confirmed by the increase of suicide, that, in fine, there is something more intolerable to the modern man than death itself—that is, life! But what do these Pessimists, so much read, offer as a Gospel for consolation? Nothing at all. There are no means of healing, they say, except the absolute dissolution of all living. And thus the modern world, in our day, arrives at that in which the ancient world ended—that is to say, despair.

When we see how this wisdom of the world, after flattering man with his likeness to God, and his oneness with Him, at last delivers him over to hopeless pain and shame, how dear to us shall be our Gospel, which crushes man only to lift him up above all understanding and all desert. How thankful should we be that we can confess, "The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men." How gratefully do our hearts beat in response to that which is our banner, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." All is not, indeed, accomplished with the confession of the mouth. Therefore, dear brethren, will we bind ourselves to live more fully in the Crucified One and in His love. Then will He live in us, the Risen One; then, only then, shall we never be put to shame, neither in this life nor in that beyond.

In the midst of heaven, John beheld an eagle soaring, with an everlasting Gospel to proclaim to all who dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and tongue, and tribe, and people. Everlasting is this Gospel, for from everlasting it was determined in the counsel of Divine Love—everlasting, for it is unchangeable, exalted above all changes of time—everlasting, for we shall hear it again in eternity as the song of praise to the Redeemer, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us with Thy blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and honour, and glory, and blessing;" and every creature in heaven and in earth and under the earth will unite in response, Amen.

C. VON ORELLI.

THE CHURCH OF THE TRANSVAAL.

THE interest excited by the annexation of the Transvaal will, perhaps, secure for its Church history an attention which it otherwise could hardly have expected. And a glimpse at the religious side of the Boer's character may possibly be something new to those who have only heard of him as the enemy of the Englishman and the native, while it cannot fail to gratify all who are large-hearted enough to believe and rejoice that, in every nation, God hath those who fear Him and work righteousness and are accepted with Him.

Just a single word on the geography and history of the country to

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

begin with. Look at a map of South Africa, and some 500 miles up the Orange river (the northern boundary of the colony of the Cape of Good Hope) you come, on its northern bank, to the Orange Free State. It is the tract of country lying between the Orange and the Vaal Rivers, about 50,000 square miles in extent, with a population of about 50,000 white people, almost all Dutch farmers. To the north of this, crossing the Vaal River, you enter the Transvaal territory, running up at one point to the 22nd degree of latitude. Its area is somewhat over 100,000 square miles, with a Dutch population of fully 30,000, and a native one of perhaps 300,000. The Orange Free State is bounded on the east by the Great Drakenberg Range: at the North Eastern point of the Free State, you cross the mountain range, and enter Natal, lying between the Drakenberg and the sea. These three territories, Transvaal, Orange Free State, and Natal, were taken possession of by our Dutch farmers at the same time, and the story of the Church of the Transvaal is interwoven with that of the two other colonies.

The settlement of these tracts of country originated on this wise. Many of the inhabitants of the Cape Colony had never become thoroughly reconciled to English rule. Losses occasioned by Kaffir wars, English legislation regarding natives, and the emancipation of the slaves, increased the discontent; and in 1834 and following years, from five to ten thousand left the colony in their ox-waggons and travelled northward, establishing a form of government, first in Natal, and afterwards in the Orange River Territory and the Transvaal.*

Among the thousands who left the colony, there were not a few who were earnestly religious men, and the most carried with them some respect for religion. According to the custom of the Dutch Church, almost all who had reached the age of sixteen or eighteen had been admitted members of the Church. The preparation for admission to membership had been the great means of keeping alive, in a scattered population in the colony, the desire to be able to understand the Bible, and attain the needful religious knowledge. Many had been living, at that time, fifty and eighty miles from a church, and could barely attend a religious service more than once or twice a-year. Among the thousands of waggons that crossed the Orange River, there were but few that did not carry the Bible and hymn-book. In very many of their encampments, as they moved along, the Sabbath was observed, and religious service held. And in not a few of the tents, the daily voice of praise could be heard at morning or evening worship.

But there were among them some who would have been marked men anywhere, whose religious character was only deepened by the difficulties they had to contend with, and who felt how much depended on them, if religion was not to be lost among the thousands who were moving out into the wilderness without a shepherd.

* For an interesting account of this portion of Cape history, I must refer the reader to "South Africa, Past and Present, by John Noble." Longmans & Co.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

One of these men I knew well, Chard Cillierz. When, at a meeting of Synod in Cape Town, in 1862, he took his seat as an elder from the Free State, he and two or three of the old emigrant farmers from Natal made their weight felt at once. Well do I remember how, as I rode with him on my first visit to the Transvaal, he told me the terrible story of their first encounter with the Zulus, and specially of that memorable Sunday when there appeared to be no help with man, and they cried to God for deliverance. On the morning of that holy day, as they saw thousands of Zulus gather round them, he stood up on the front of his waggon, Bible in hand; and, calling those who were preparing for battle around, he asked them whether, if God were that day to save them, they would indeed serve Him and be His people, and vow ever to observe that day in remembrance of God's mercy. And then, standing there with uncovered head, he led the people in prayer, and covenanted with God, that, if He would save them from the hands of the heathen, the Lord should be their God. For more than thirty years afterwards, that day was never forgotten by him, but spent as a day of prayer, confessing the sin of the people, and asking for the blessing of the Spirit. And often he would gather others around him, long after he had left Natal for the Free State, to remind them that they were a covenant people whom God had delivered from the heathen, no less truly than Israel of old.

As a proof that he did not stand alone, it is interesting to know that, no sooner had Natal been conquered, and the plan of their first town (Pieter Maritzburg) laid out, than a church was at once built, in fulfilment of the vow. A narrative, from a Dutch Church magazine, of what took place some years ago, may be interesting, as showing how much of the feeling still lives among the people:—

"The never-to-be-forgotten day at Blood River was commemorated on Sunday, 16th December (1866), by a religious service. After Retief with his seventy men had been treacherously murdered by Dingaan on the 4th February, 1838, the savages surprised the lager at Blauw Krans and Moundsprint, and murdered men, women, and children. In succeeding battles, the farmers had lost many of their men. It was on Sunday morning, 16th December, 1838, that the lager of the Boers was surrounded by the Zulus. The struggle appeared an unequal one: some 12,000 Zulus were coming down on not more than 400 men enclosed within their encampment of waggons. But the Lord was with them, and gave them the victory. It was in memory of the vow then made, that the Presbytery of Natal, in 1864, called on the congregations to commemorate that day, and that this year a gathering was held on the very spot, the farm of Mr. L. de Jager. A lager of waggons in which the people had come up to the service, was drawn up on the very spot where the former lager had stood, and tents were placed to serve as a church. After service on Sabbath morning, and a sermon from Exodus xvii. 15 in the afternoon, all gathered to erect a monument, each bringing a stone. Earnest words were spoken, reminding all of their calling to live in this land, so that God's name might be glorified and made known to the heathen too. After the minister, four of the members of the congregation spoke. The minister then addressed a large number of Zulus who were present, mentioning that he had that morning

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

received a message from Cetewayo, saying he was glad he had come there to have service. They had come together to erect a monument in memory of what their God had done for them, but the name of that monument would be Peace, and he trusted there would be permanent peace between the white man and the Zulus."

In later years, I came to know the good man whose name has been mentioned. When an elder of a congregation in the Free State which had no minister, he spent weeks in going about his parish, appointing diets of catechising and visitation, and exhorting all to repent and believe. Such men were the salt and the light of the emigrant Boers, and did much to maintain the religious character of the people.

In one respect, their Christianity could perhaps not have passed muster. Calvinistic Presbyterianism has always been specially fond of the Old Testament. It finds there, in the distinct manifestations of the sovereignty and the righteousness of God, the everlasting foundations on which New Testament grace can alone securely rest. Its theology has, perhaps, not yet fully apprehended and expressed the real difference between the Life of the New Dispensation of the Spirit, and the Shadow of the time of preparation. And its piety has often had more in it of the Old Testament type, with its bondage and its darkness, than of the New. It will be no wonder, then, if we find these comparatively illiterate, though God-fearing men not able to distinguish very clearly between the relation of Israel to the heathen in Canaan, and their own to the savages by whom they saw themselves surrounded. It will not appear strange that they thought that, in going forth to conquer them and possess their land, they were extending Christianity. And yet many of them were most willing to have the heathen taught. The difficulties which have, more than once, arisen with missionaries, have not always had their origin in the refusal to allow the black man to be taught, but in the political interest from which it is impossible to separate mission-work. There have always been among missionaries, as well as among Europeans generally, two policies with regard to the black man. The one makes Liberty and Equality its watchword, and seeks, politically and religiously, to put him on a level with the white man. With the other party, Subjection and Discipline are the ruling idea: the native races are like children who have not yet attained their majority, for whom there must be a special legislation and training before they are fit to take the place of free men. Generally speaking, the tendency of English missionaries has been towards the former policy, while their German brethren have been much more the supporters of authority. It will be easily understood that the Boer sides with the latter, and that unpleasant collisions with missionaries (as in the case of Livingstone himself), are to be attributed, not to simple hatred of the missionary and his work, but to questions of nationality and of policy with which they have been identified, especially in the minds of men not accustomed to discriminate carefully. Not long after the difficulties in the Transvaal with Livingstone, and the expulsion from thence of the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

two missionaries, Edwards and Inglis, the Boer Government gave every encouragement to German missionaries, and their relation to them has been almost entirely free from difficulty.

But I have been anticipating. It is strange that the first minister of the emigrant Boers should have been a missionary. When the American Board began its mission to the Zulus, it heard of the portion of the tribe which, under Moselekatze, after desolating the northern parts of the Orange River territory, and a considerable portion of the Transvaal, had settled on the western border of the Transvaal. Three of its missionaries began their work here in 1836. In the course of that year, Moselekatze had more than once attacked, and almost destroyed, small parties of the advancing Boers; in the commencement of 1837, the Boers attacked and conquered him. They advised the American missionaries not to stay, for fear of his vengeance falling on them as white men. The missionaries accompanied the Boers, and afterwards prosecuted their journey to their brethren in Natal. One of the three then brought out was Mr. Lindley. The acquaintanceship then formed resulted in a friendship, and not long after he was requested by the Boers in Natal to become their pastor. In the report of the American Board for 1839 we read, "The Boers were determined to have Mr. Lindley for their pastor. They built him a house, and nearly supported him. He preached to them on the Sabbath, and taught a school of nearly 100 scholars. He found some pious people among them, and organised a church, with men of suitable character for officers. They insisted that he should take a dismission from the Board, and be legally settled among them as a minister of the Reformed Dutch Church. They insisted that they needed his labour as much as the Zulus did. It was certain that a large part of the Zulus would be settled among them as a dependent peasantry, and that the prevalence of religion among them was indispensable to the success of the mission. For such reasons, all parties thought the request ought to be granted. The arrangement has since been made."

For seven or eight years from this time, Mr. Lindley spent several months, each year, in long ox-waggon journeys into the Orange and Transvaal territories.

At previously appointed centres, large numbers would congregate in their waggons, and days would be spent in catechising and admitting members, in preaching and administering the sacraments. In two or three villages that had been established, churches were organised. To this day, the name of Mr. Lindley is remembered with love and gratitude. As a proof of this, a new village laid out two years ago in the district of Harrismith, in the Orange Free State, received the name of Lindley. The affection is mutual. I have heard that the missionary has said, that, were he to begin life again, he would like nothing better than to be a Boer minister.

When I think of the enthusiastic missionary addresses of the old

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

man in America, of which I have heard, I cannot but think that there must be more in the religious side of the Boer's character than most missionaries know, thus to have won his confidence and esteem.

It was in 1847 that the Dutch Church of the colony sent its first deputation to visit the farmers across the Vaal. The welcome was so hearty, and the work found to be so important, that, in the following year, a second deputation went, organising several congregations. In the next year, the new territories received their first stated pastor in the appointment to Bloemfontein, the chief town of the Orange Free State, of the Rev. Andrew Murray. With the whole of the Orange State as his parish, an annual visit of eight or ten weeks was all the Transvaal could have. In the published reports we have an interesting picture of the style of work to be done. After three or four days' riding on horseback, some sixty miles a-day, the minister reaches the appointed place. One to two hundred waggons are gathered on the ground, many of the waggons with their tents beside them. A church has been built of reeds, roofed over with the sail coverings from the waggons. For three, sometimes four, days there is preaching two or three times a-day. Sixty to eighty young people have to be examined for admission to the church. There are upwards of a hundred children to be baptised; the parents have to be addressed. To the people, the thought that it is the one church gathering of the year gives interest and excitement; to the minister, the thought is one of sad and sometimes terrible solemnity. By the Monday evening or Tuesday morning, all is still, and the minister starts again for the next station.

It was in 1853 that the Transvaal got its own first minister. The interest excited in Holland by the establishment of a Dutch Republic had led to plans for aiding the emigrant Boers in various ways, among others, the supplying of their spiritual wants. Unfortunately, the selection was not in the right hands, and Mr. van der Hoff, a man of the rationalistic school, was sent. The evil influence of this was felt, not only in his preaching, but in another way. The Synod of the Dutch Church at the Cape had just begun to take measures for guarding itself against the introduction from Holland, where, at that time, our Cape young men were studying, of those unsound in the faith. Partly in opposition to this orthodoxy, partly from the desire to break as much as possible the connection with the English colony, he led most of the congregations of the Transvaal to separate from the Cape Church. With three ministers from the same school in Holland, there have been at work influences, which, notwithstanding the traditional reverence of the Boers for religion and for orthodoxy, cannot but have been injurious to the real spiritual life of the country.

But Holland had a different gift in store for the Transvaal. I have spoken of its love for the Old Testament as one of the characteristics of our Calvinistic Presbyterianism. We all know how this has manifested itself, with some, in their preference of the Psalms alone to hymns and

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

spiritual songs in public worship. As in the Highlands of Scotland, so in the downs of the Netherlands, the question has been one of life or death. The dissenting Reformed Church of Holland owes its origin very much to the refusal to own the hymn-book introduced some seventy years ago. In the inland parts of the Cape Colony, there were three or four districts in which the same spirit prevailed. Without their having any intercourse with Holland—many of them were descendants of the French refugees—the hymns were at once condemned, and their use in the public service was felt to be a sore grievance. Churches and Christians are slow to learn what it is to bear the weak, and so ministers were seen persistently giving out hymns in congregations where four-fifths sat with closed books and lips. Among these psalm-singing Christians there were noble and earnest men ; but, as a rule, their opposition to mission-work was strong, and, in several cases, the attempt to give coloured people a seat in the church gave rise to trouble. There was still another secret grievance: they could not exactly accuse their ministers of not being orthodox, and yet their modes of thought and expression were no longer those of the Synod of Dort and the seventeenth century theology as they found it in the religious books in use among them. When, in course of time, they heard of a dissenting Church in Holland which would not sing hymns, and sought, both in Church order and doctrine, literally to maintain the tradition of Dort, they longed for deliverance. Letters were written asking aid. In 1857 a Mr. Pastma was sent out to the Cape, specially charged with the interests of mission-work, and to make inquiries as to the people of whom they had received tidings. His first visit was to the Transvaal ; and he had not long been there, before a new dissenting Church was constituted, where many of these men were not to be found, and where the rationalistic character of the ministers gave strength to their orthodoxy. In the Free State and the Colony, congregations were also formed. With wonderful energy, a theological college was established, and married men who had grown up as farmers gave themselves to be trained as ministers.

The question of missions caused some trouble. The new society took the name of Reformed Church, in opposition to the Dutch Reformed, the name of the State Church. Without forcing matters, the principle of the duty of the Church to do mission-work was distinctly enunciated ; and there cannot be a doubt that the disruption, however undesirable in some respects, has gained access for this truth with some who never would have accepted it from men in whom they had not such perfect confidence. I was much interested in seeing lately, in a report of a conference on the state of religion in the Transvaal in one of the dissenting Churches, that more than one elder mentioned, as a reason for the low state of religion, the neglect of duty to the heathen.

There were thus two organised Churches in the Transvaal ; outside of these, there were two or three congregations still adhering to the mother Church of the Colony. In 1866, these were again organised into a

separate Church. This time, again, it was Holland that gave them a leader. Mr. Cachet, who had studied in Scotland, trained in the seminary in Amsterdam, sought to raise a standard against the laxity of the State Church, and to gather out of it all who were dissatisfied with its teaching. Not only were congregations established, but great good was done in directing attention to the distinctive doctrines of the Gospel, and warning against liberalising tendencies. The new Church took the name of the Church of the Colony, "Dutch Reformed," distinguishable from the name of the State Church only by having a somewhat less modern form of the Dutch word for Reformed (the one *Hervormd*, the other *Gereformeerd*).

Latterly, even the *Hervormden* have not been anxious for a supply of ministers from Holland; and when the two Churches both obtain earnest young men from the Theological Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church of the colony, the time cannot be far distant when the two bodies will reunite. And there are some who think they even see indications, among the members of the so-called dissenting Church, of a desire to stand in closer relation to each other. It everywhere takes more time to heal than to rend; in this, the land of the ox-waggon, we specially need time and patience, but the Divine Life has in it a power to heal and to unite which gives us hope.

I have been telling of Churches; the history of Churches is not always the history of religion. What of the Divine Life itself in the Churches? I fear that the account cannot be called very favourable. Ministers and earnest Christian men unite in saying that the unrest and excitement, which the want of quiet rule has caused, and which, through the events of the last few years, has grown into discontent and bitterness, have left their mark on the people. There are some districts in which the prevailing tone of religion is higher than in most. One of these, regarded as having been the most neglected, has been the scene of a very powerful revival during the last two years, through the labours of a missionary to the natives in connection with the Dutch Reformed Church, himself brought up among the farmers of the colony, and understanding how to reach them. One result of his work has been, that three young sons of the Transvaal have offered themselves for mission-work. Amid the disturbances of a land like this, the Scripture command to pray for rulers that "we may lead a *quiet and peaceable* life in all godliness," acquires a new meaning; and Christians are praying for a calm to come over the troubled waters, that ears and hearts may again be opened to listen aright to the Gospel of redeeming love. The very slowness of our country and people, in some respects such a hindrance, offers here a ground of hope. Visitors have often expressed their surprise that, in the midst of his wanderings and troubles, the African farmer has not retrograded more rapidly. His natural conservatism, and the tenacity with which his religious traditions are maintained, encourage us to trust that, when present political troubles are over, and the hoped-for time of restored

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

peace has come, it will be found that a time of blessing will come for the people too.

Thus I have introduced the Presbyterian Boers of the Transvaal to their brethren throughout the world. There have been witnesses enough to bring up a report of the evil there is in the land ; it has been my privilege to tell of the good there is, and the good we hope for. Let every Christian give them a cordial welcome to their place in the Church Catholic, and, amid the present troubles, a large share of sympathy and prayer. God is able to raise them up, and, even from among them, take pioneers in the work of winning Africa for Christ.

[We have pleasure in inserting the above communication from a gentleman of the highest character in the Cape Colony, although some of his views fail to carry conviction to our minds. On this point, however, we do not venture to say anything of our own ; but, as reference is made to the case of Dr. Livingstone, we deem it right to allow the great missionary to speak for himself. We happen to have in our possession, and at our disposal, an elaborate paper by Dr. Livingstone on the Boers, in which he goes into a number of points very interesting at the present day, and throws light on the origin of the troubles of England with the natives of South Africa—troubles which he thinks might have been easily avoided. We propose, in our next number, to give some portions of this striking paper.—Ed. C. P.]

NATURALISATION OF THE CHURCH IN HEATHEN COUNTRIES.

FROM various causes, the Churches established by our missionaries in foreign lands have, in very many cases, a character almost as distinctly foreign to the country as the missionary himself who founded them. The evil and disadvantage of this state of things are more and more felt by those engaged in mission-work ; hence, the naturalisation of our foreign mission Churches is taking a place among the foremost questions of the day touching evangelistic work. In one form or another, it presses upon our Mission Boards and Committees, and has even made its appearance lately in our General Assemblies.

To the naturalisation of the Church in any country, three things seem to be essential :—

I. The standards of doctrine and polity must be adapted as closely as possible to the actual, specific conditions of society in each country.

II. All Churches, at one in their fundamental articles of doctrine and polity, waiving minor distinctions, should be organically united.

III. Finally, in due time and order, there must be entire ecclesiastical severance from the parent Churches in Europe and America.

In the present article, we propose to confine ourselves to the consideration of the first of these three propositions.

This principle of the adaptation of doctrinal and ecclesiastical standards requires, in such standards, three conditions :—

(1.) Brevity and simplicity ; (2.) the exclusion of what is accidental and foreign ; (3.) adaptation, in form, to the special prevailing errors and needs of each people.

1. As distinguished from the symbols of our occidental Churches, the articles of faith for our foreign mission Churches should be few and briefly stated ; their form of government should be given in general principles and outline, rather than in detail. By this, it is not intended that we should seek to base our mission Churches upon a few propositions, vaguely stated, or elastic enough to comprehend alike Calvinism and Pelagianism. What is brief is not necessarily indefinite. Five brief propositions suffice to carry, by implication, the entire Calvinistic system. Neither would we be understood to depreciate the value and importance, under proper conditions, of a Confession of Faith as elaborate as that of Westminster, or a Catechism as full as that of Heidelberg. Whether such detail of statement in doctrinal symbols be expedient or not, at present, for us in Europe and America, is an independent question, which is in no sense raised in the present paper. It is simply urged that, whatever may be expedient for us in Christian lands, yet, in organising a Church in a heathen or Mohammedan country, if we wish to see such Churches from the first take root, and grow as native to the country, we must beware of imposing on them our elaborate foreign formulas of doctrine and polity. We must be content to begin with a very brief and simple Confession. We must leave the elaboration of details to the native Churches themselves, under conditions which Providence may assign to them.

Even on the general principles which we follow in secular education, this appears to be sound policy. We teach the child, first, the general principles of any science ; acquaintance with minute details belongs to a later stage of his education. Practically, the "form of sound doctrine," which every sensible Christian parent delivers to a child, is a very simple thing as compared with the theology which he may get later in life. For very little children, we need something still shorter than the Shorter Catechism. Just so is it with Churches in their organic character. The young Churches in a heathen country, as compared with the mature Churches of Europe and America, whose life is already measured by centuries, are as children compared with men. We should have the sense to recognise this difference, and be content to begin by delivering to them, not details, but "the first principles of the doctrine of Christ." The rest will come in due time. And this, moreover, has been God's plan in the communication of His truth. There has been, as we all know, a progress in the Divine revelation of doctrine to the Church. After this manner, also, we are expressly told, did our Lord Jesus Christ teach the people. He did not deliver to them a full system of doctrine at once, but "spake the word unto them as they were able to hear it"

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

(Mark iv. 33). Even to His chosen apostles He plainly said: "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now" (John xvi. 12). And the chief of the apostles, and first missionary to the heathen, followed, in this matter, his Master's example. He wrote to the Corinthians, he tells us—to a new Church, be it observed, in an idolatrous city—"as unto babes in Christ," and "fed them with milk, and not with meat" for, said he, "hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able" (1 Cor. iii. 2). Thus, both a due regard to the general principles which regulate all wise education,—and, much more, the authority and example of Christ Himself and His inspired apostles,—forbid us to deliver to our new-born Churches, in heathen and Mohammedan lands, the elaborate symbols of our Western Churches as the fundamental condition of their organisation. Under their method, the Church took root readily in every land alike, and was something else than a transplanted Jewish Christianity.

2. Our next proposition follows naturally from the foregoing. Both in general as Christians, and even as Presbyterians, if we would secure the early naturalisation of the Church in heathen lands, we must make up our minds to exclude from their creed and summary of Church law, whatever belongs merely to the accidents of Presbyterianism. Nor is this said in disparagement of any beliefs or practices peculiar to one body of Presbyterians or another, as if it were of no consequence, in such things, what one might believe. On the contrary, it is granted that this may often be of much consequence. None the less, however, do we urge that, when establishing the Church in a foreign land, we should base it on those things in which we all agree, and not on those in which we differ. Presbyterians have claimed and fought unto blood for liberty to determine freely their forms of faith and worship. We should be true to our traditions, and cheerfully allow, to our native foreign Churches, the same liberty which we have enjoyed. As the providence of God in this matter guided and determined the specific form of our Church confessions, so may we trust that, under different conditions, it will also guide them. Moreover, whatever we may conceive to be the importance of a "testimony" regarding any non-essential particular of our faith, we must all agree that it must be of still greater importance, that, in the midst of opposing heathen, ignorant of, or unable to appreciate, the deeper spiritual unity which binds together all true believers, the Church should, as far as possible, present a united front to the enemy. The evils of sectarian division, if great at home, must be far greater abroad. In our imperfect state, we may, perhaps, never be able entirely to avoid them; but we are surely bound, among the heathen especially, to minimise our differences and magnify our agreements. It is a solemn responsibility to impose upon new Churches, in heathen lands, the lines of our denominational divisions. It can be justified by nothing less than the clearest light of duty, and the most imperative necessity.

It will, doubtless, be objected by some, that this line of argument

would seem to forbid our founding Churches which should have any one determinate form whatever, and not only forbid the reproduction of Presbyterian divisions in our foreign fields, but equally of any denominational distinctions whatever. But, while fully believing that it is quite possible, on heathen soil, to reduce the divisions of Christendom to a very small number, we must admit that our principle must be limited by the very nature of the case. For example, we are bound, by apostolic authority, to provide for such new Churches some form of government. Without such form, organisation is impossible. But then, it must needs be one form, and not another. From the very nature of the case, we are compelled to choose one which shall be essentially Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Congregational. Hence we argue, not for a general ignoring of denominational distinctions,—which is simply impossible,—but for a determined ignoring, on the mission-field, of all distinctions belonging to the several subdivisions of the Presbyterian family, as such. Both on general principles, and from personal experience, so much as this seems, to the writer, to be not only practicable, but a high Christian duty. To sum up this part of our argument, it is urged that, in order to the speedy naturalisation of the Church in any country, we are not to insist upon details, but only on general principles of doctrine and polity. Principles are of the God of the Bible, and therefore, like the Bible, are not of national and local, but universal use and application. Details, on the contrary, bear the marks of time and place; and in so far as we insist upon them, the Churches which we plant in heathen lands must remain as foreign in spirit, as in origin, from the country in which they exist.

3. In the third place, the principle for which we argue demands that the symbols of the Church, in each country, shall set forth the truth of God in specific contrast with the errors specially current among its people, and with careful regard to their specific conditions.

An illustration will make our meaning clear. Let us suppose the present state of thing reversed,—that India had been a Christian land for centuries, while America and Great Britain had remained, like the actual India of to-day, with considerable intellectual culture, yet in their original heathenism. Meantime, through the centuries, the Hindu Church would have been developing its creed, form of government, and mode of worship, under conditions exceedingly different from those which have given shape to our occidental symbols.

The doctrinal statements of the Hindu would, doubtless, have been framed to meet the inherent tendency of the Indian mind to idealism and pantheism. In form, they would probably have more resembled the sententious aphorisms of Kapila, than the elaborated propositions of the Westminster Confession. In this form of Presbyterian government, we would assuredly find little trace of that ultra-democratic sentiment which is so powerfully modifying Presbyterianism in America. His very forms of worship would have been different; like Christ Himself, the preacher

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

would have sat when preaching ; and, like Moses, he would have removed, not his head-dress, but his shoes, when entering the house of God. Now, suppose such a Hindu Christian missionary to come to a heathen London or New York, and retain and insist upon his converts adopting Christianity in its specific Hindu form ; is it not plain that he would be at an immense disadvantage ? He might teach the true doctrine of the cross ; but what if his doctrinal statements were shaped to meet, not Western errors, but Oriental ! Would formulas, determined by old controversies, of bygone centuries, on the banks of the Ganges or Yang-tse-Kiang, be likely to suit the case ? Or, is there any probability that the truth, presented in such a form to the supposed heathen European or American, would be readily received, or soon take deep root in the national life ? "To those without law," said the first great missionary to the heathen, "I became as without law, that I might gain them that are without law." That was Paul's way ; and if we would emulate Paul's success, we must in this, as in other things, imitate Paul's method.

It is, therefore, we believe, most important for the missionary, at the outset, to recognise the fact that our occidental confessions, and formulas of doctrine and government,—rightly so dear to him, just in proportion as they set forth with precision the truth of God in its relations to the history of opposing error in the West,—must needs be, so far, ill-adapted to the necessities of Churches under such different historical conditions. Let us not be misunderstood. God's truth is one and the same eternally. What is true in America or Great Britain is true in China or Japan. If, for example, the Calvinistic, as opposed to the Arminian system of doctrine, rightly represent, in its fundamental principles, the revealed truth of God, then this, and not something else, is the true system all the world over. But while this is true, it surely does not follow that every doctrine must always be stated in the same way, or have the same prominence in the system. None of us will be disposed to undervalue the syllogism ; but it does not follow that, for practical purposes, it is the best way of putting an argument before the mind of a Hindu, who is accustomed, instead, to the fivefold division of an argument. So with the case before us. We believe, for example, in the doctrine of fore-ordination, as set forth in the Westminster Standards. But, granting the doctrine, it does not follow that it must always be stated in that same manner, or even that it must have the same practical prominence in the system. We are to remember that the form and prominence of that doctrine, as set forth among us, has been largely determined by a general tendency, on the other side, to magnify the sphere of human freedom at the expense of the Divine sovereignty. But what if we find ourselves, as in a Buddhist or Mohammedan country, confronted with the opposite tendency,—to minimise or even nullify freedom, and affirm the predetermination of all actions, either by an impersonal fate, or by a supreme personal Will, who makes all free actions, not merely certain, but inexorably necessary ? Is it not plain that the doctrine in question

needs, under such conditions, a statement very different from that which has been wisely accepted among us? In a word, in the one case, we want a statement of predestination chiefly, as opposed to contingency; in the other, prominence must be given to human liberty and responsibility, as opposed to necessity and fatalism.

It will not be hard to show that, if Presbytery is to be naturalised among a foreign people, the same necessity exists for modification of many details of Church polity, as well as doctrinal statement. The elaborate systems of European and American Presbyterianism represent centuries of historical growth, and their present form has been determined under certain well-known historic conditions. But many of those conditions have been strikingly different from those under which our mission Churches find themselves. To illustrate: when our system of polity was framed, the work of modern missions was yet in the future; hence, they are absolutely silent as regards the precise functions and authority of the missionary or evangelist, his complex relations to the parent Church which sends him out, to the foreign churches which he organises, and to their several pastors. Hence has arisen no little confusion, and, if we mistake not, error in practice, among our mission Churches. Here we have a body of Presbyterian ministers, with no common Presbyterian organisation; here, again, a "mission," as it is called, consisting of foreign ministers only, coexisting, perhaps, with Presbytery, and exercising many of its most important functions, practically,—and we dare not say, unwisely,—holding, temporarily, some such position, in relation to the native ministry and churches, as a bench of bishops! Here, again, throughout whole missions, we find ministers sent out by the Home Church as evangelists, to preach and organise self-governing Churches, failing, as our standards do, to distinguish sharply the office of evangelist from that of pastor, and hence becoming themselves pastors of the native Churches. Hence, their evangelistic labours are incalculably diminished; and, worse still, the native Churches, in default of native pastors, are kept for years in a state of helpless dependence on the foreign missionary, which is simply fatal to the healthy growth of an independent, self-sustaining life. Thus, as the result, such "Mission Churches," preached to by foreign pastors, supported chiefly by foreign money, and governed, in great part, by a foreign mission, in a foreign fashion, stand before the surrounding heathen community as foreign and alien organisations, connection with which involves scarcely less the sacrifice of all independent, national spirit, than treason to an ancestral faith. This, happily, is far from being the universal state of things; but, in India at least, we have quite too much of it. Few, however, even among those who have felt themselves constrained to work in such a fashion, will deny that this condition of things is most undesirable, and that there can be no naturalisation of the Church in any country, so long as it exists. Hence it is evident that any form of government, however excellent, which fails to recognise and provide for such conditions, must be

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1870.]

greatly modified before it can well serve for an Indian, Persian, or Chinese Church.

All this becomes still more plain when we consider the pastoral office. Both at home and on the foreign field, the truth is every year more and more distinctly recognised, that, from the very first, our foreign Churches should be served by native pastors. If, for the present, many of these are often inferior to the foreign missionary in general intellectual character, still, their superior acquaintance with the language, modes of thought, and customs of the people, more than compensates for this. There can be no such thing as the naturalisation of the Church, without a native pastorate. And we hail it as one of the good signs of the times, that the home Churches are insisting,—of late much more than formerly,—upon the prompt formation of a native pastorate in their foreign mission-fields, and thereby show that they are waking up to the importance of naturalising the Church in foreign lands, and are perceiving one, at least, of the most important and necessary steps to that end.

In many missions, indeed—as, *e.g.*, those of the American Board in Western India, and in the Euphrates Valley, and in certain of the most developed Scotch missions in India—great and encouraging progress has been made, of late years, in this direction. But, in many other missions, the enormous difficulties which have met all endeavours to establish a native pastorate, after the European model, raise the question, whether, as regards the precise form of the pastoral office also, our Western forms of government may not be as ill-adapted to many foreign fields as our Western formulas of doctrine. This is, indeed, so far recognised by our missionaries, as that, if we mistake not, it would be hard to find a Presbyterian missionary in India or China who would insist upon those literary qualifications and specific Presbyterian examinations, as a prerequisite to ordination, which are so wisely required in our occidental Churches. But it is perhaps a question whether, if we will wisely meet the peculiar difficulties of many missions, we should not go much further. The pastoral office itself, as vesting in one man, endowed with authority, and supported by the people, was the growth of years.

If we rightly understand the history of the primitive Church, the government and instruction of the Churches were, first of all, vested in a bench of co-equal elders, who divided pastoral work among them as Providence might direct. On such a plan, feeble churches, unable fully to support a pastor, could yet be well served by the joint labours of a plural eldership, till such time as, by a healthy, natural growth, they were ready for the support of an individual pastorate. Granting, then, as we may without hesitation, that our pastoral system is the best for most European and American Churches, does it follow that it must be the best for most Churches in India, China, or Africa? And might it not very possibly, in many mission-fields, be wiser not to begin with our individual pastorate, but to go back to the primitive model, and commence with the form of government at once most primitive and most

Presbyterian,—a plural pastorate by co-equal elders? Beginning thus, might we not safely allow the native Churches, under due instruction, and, above all, the guidance of God's providence and Spirit, to develop details for themselves?

As regards the various suggestions made above, by way of illustration, the writer would not have them understood as dogmatic expressions of opinion. Those who, like him, have known, by some experience on mission-ground, something of the practical difficulties in which such questions are often involved, will be least inclined to dogmatise about them. The general principles which should govern our mission-policy, with a view to the naturalisation of the foreign Churches, seem sufficiently clear. Their specific application to the diverse conditions of different mission-fields, must be mainly left to those familiar with each field, and, as remarked at the beginning, is at present one of the most urgent and important practical questions connected with the foreign mission-work of the Church.

As to the general principles discussed, the writer believes that he is far from being alone in his judgment. But the views now expressed have been formed after a careful study of what has fallen within his own experience and under his observation.*

S. H. KELLOGG.

* We append a few references to similar expressions of opinion by various missionary bodies: these will be justly entitled to more regard than the opinion of any individual.

In November, 1873, there was held, at Allahabad, a Conference of Presbyterian missionaries in India, in which were represented eleven different branches of the Presbyterian family. They issued a letter to the Presbyterian Churches in India and Ceylon, from which we quote the following expressions:—

"All the Presbyterian Churches are one in doctrine and in polity. The lesser differences, to which their separate organisations at home are due, are not such as to require or to justify their continued separation in India. . . . While the fundamental principles of our polity are agreeable to the Word of God, and therefore of constant obligation upon us, the application of those principles must be determined, in part, by the circumstances of different countries and times."

To these and similar expressions of opinion, we find appended the names of ministers of the American Presbyterian Church, the Established, the Free, and the United Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, and the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America. The Presbyterian Confederation of India, which was developed from this Conference in 1876, addressed to the General Assemblies and Synods in Europe and America a letter touching the organic union of Presbyterians in India. The General Assembly (1876) of the American Presbyterian Church referred this letter to their Board of Foreign Missions, which reported to the Assembly of 1877, affirming the same general principles in the following terms:—

"No one would wish to perpetuate, amongst Hindu, Chinese, or Japanese Christians, such national or local peculiarities of church organisation as may exist in the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, Holland, or the United States; but greater union is to be sought, provided it is not sought at the expense of truth and order."

As regarding Church Standards, the Board further recommended, that—

"It shall be referred to the missionary Synods, or . . . Presbyteries which contain at least three foreign members, to take order concerning Articles of Faith, Government, Discipline, Directory of Public Worship, and Rules for Judicatories. It shall be left to

THE PROBLEM OF THE LABOURING CLASSES.

III.—IN GREAT BRITAIN.

WHATEVER the intelligent and aspiring working people of Great Britain may think of the schemes of German Socialists, American levellers, or French communists, it is certain that no such revolutionary projects are deliberately or extensively cherished among them at the present time. There is no revolutionary method of rectifying social wrongs, towards the realisation of which their united efforts are directed. Indeed, the social aims of the labouring classes have a more desultory aspect, at the present day, than forty or fifty years ago, when they were struggling for political emancipation. But it does not by any means follow that their minds are more at rest, or that they have become satisfied with things as they are. Rightly or wrongly, it is an unquestionable fact that there is much dissatisfaction among them. The problem of labour is far from being solved in Great Britain. The direction which the aspirations and efforts of the people themselves will take, towards the rectification of what they believe to be wrong, is one of the great uncertainties of the future. There is so much strong feeling on the subject as to make it possible that, ere long, something more definite will shape itself before them, and become the object of their eager pursuit. On nothing, probably, does the future history of this country more depend, than the direction which this current may take. Meanwhile, nothing revolutionary is contemplated; and if we should be favoured with a well-filled throne, considerate legislation, and a more sympathetic spirit between rich and poor, the current may flow on as quietly as before.

In this paper, my object shall be, in the first place, to indicate what the feelings of the working classes are in regard to our present social arrangements; secondly, in regard to religion; and lastly, to throw out some hints as to the manner in which the Christian Church seems called to treat the problem, alike in the interest of the people, and in the interest of Christianity itself.

their judgment to determine the parts that ought to be included in their action on these subjects, having a wise regard to the degree of Christian knowledge and advancement whereunto the native Churches have attained; but the condition is herein expressly made, that, in these standards, nothing contrary to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America shall be adopted."

The (American) Synod of India, at its next meeting expressed, formally and explicitly, its satisfaction with the above sentiments and recommendation of the Board of Foreign Missions.

Last of all, we may refer to the recent action of the Churches connected with the mission of the American Presbyterian Church in Persia, "touching the revising or enacting of a Book of Faith and Discipline for the Persian Church." (See *Catholic Presbyterian* for October, pages 319, 320.)

I.

The root of not a little of the dissatisfaction felt with the present order of society is to be found in the impression, that, for all that has been said, labour is still looked down on, and the labourer does not get the consideration which is due to him, in virtue of the service he renders to society. When the labourer thinks of the various parts that men play in the work of the world, he is unable to see that the labourer's share is of so little consequence or value as to be fitly and truly indicated by his actual social position. The four great necessities of human life are food, clothing, shelter, and fuel. Yet those whose energies are directed to provide these necessities—the labourer who tills the ground, the labourer who makes clothes, the labourer who builds houses, and the labourer who digs out fuel—are less thought of than most other classes of society. In proportion, too, as a man stands near to the object itself, or near to actual toil, is he counted less worthy of honour. If he be a farmer who has his gang of labourers, or a manufacturer who has his hundreds of hands, or a contractor who directs the operations of a great squad, or a proprietor of coal who owns whole villages of miners' houses—in other words, if he never touches the actual work of providing the chief necessities of life with one of his fingers, but merely directs the work of others, he is held entitled to considerable honour. But the moment a man touches the product itself, and earns his bread in the sweat of his brow, his position goes down. Direct utility, in fact, seems to bring direct discredit. Working men do not see why this should be. Many of the best of them are saying—On the whole, no doubt, it is wisest for us to make the best of things as we find them; but there is something wrong in the system—"something rotten in the state of Denmark."

This has always been a prevalent view among working people; but it is not one which, *in this vague form*, can lead to much good. If a man's position were to be determined alone by the usefulness of his work, the ox or the horse that draws his plough might have some claim to rank along with him. It has ever been true that, along with labour, you must take into account the amount of *mental power* that is connected with it. Among workmen themselves this principle is acknowledged. The unskilled labourer ranks beneath the skilled artisan; the foreman ranks higher than the artisan; it is but carrying out the same principle that the head of the business should rank higher than all. The educated and leisurely classes are *presumed* to have higher mental power than others, though the fact does not always correspond to the presumption. No doubt, the tendency generally has been to an undue depreciation of physical labour. In this country, however, the position of the workman has been steadily rising. It is to be hoped that it will rise still higher; but this will not be the result of mere grumbling on the part of workmen; it will result from a growing sense of justice in the community, and from the prevalence of a higher character among workmen; and it

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

will show itself in the remedy of all specific acts of unfairness or oppression towards them.

Another prevalent source of dissatisfaction is the land-laws of the country. The soil of a country is God's gift to its people. A body of men, taking possession of an unoccupied territory, get its soil as their first gift—as the capital out of which they are to make their living, and to make their country. Whatever laws it may be right and necessary to make, for dividing the soil and protecting its occupants, it ought never to be alienated from its first purpose—as essentially the nation's property for the nation's good. These, we fancy, are social axioms. Now, it is the complaint of the working classes of Great Britain, that its soil has been alienated from its first purpose, and is not in any special sense the nation's property for the nation's good. True, it yields food for the people, but in no other way than the soil of Russia, or of Hungary, or of America, or any other country from which we import food. There has not even been reserved enough out of the free proceeds of the soil to defray the national expenditure: even for this, labour has to contribute its share. And the whole of our laws and customs relating to the land seem to show that it is intended more to enable the few to live in elegant leisure, than to promote the welfare of the many. The laws of primogeniture, entail, and the like, all tend to keep it in the hands of the favoured few; while the actual cultivator of the soil—the agricultural labourer or farm servant—is literally nobody, and nothing would be more utopian than for him to hope that the smallest fragment of it should ever become his. The ox that treadeth out the corn is ever kept muzzled. The capabilities of the soil are contracted by artificial regulations and extravagant tastes. Any little fragments of land which have come down to the people from better times, such as commons, old roadways, picturesque glens, and the like, have often to be defended at the point of the bayonet from the grasp of the rich man. In consequence of such things, a widespread dissatisfaction exists with present land arrangements. It is impossible to peruse any of the "labour journals" of England, especially those which profess to represent the interests and feelings of the agricultural labourer, without being struck with the wide prevalence and firm hold of these views.

But, as all the world knows, the prevalent dissatisfaction is chiefly with the relations of capital and labour. There is a strong feeling, not only that, as a matter of fact, the labourer does not get his fair share of profit on the article which he helps to make, but that the old system of things tended to prevent him from getting it. Hence the unions on the one hand, and the combinations of masters on the other, that have given such a chequered aspect to the industrial history of the past twenty years and more. The object of the union has been to secure for the labourer his just share, as he deems, of the value of what he produces. He has been led to the conviction that he is entitled to a larger share than he used to get, partly by the difficulty he has found in living and bringing up a

family on his wages, and partly by the immense fortunes which have often crowned the efforts of employers. At first, he thought that, in the plan of combination with his fellow-workmen, he had found the true key to the problem. Practically, unionism has not solved the problem; but the workman still believes that it is his interest to promote unionism, though it is not a complete remedy. He sees that, with a falling market, combination is powerless to effect its object; and, moreover, he finds that the combinations of workmen lead to combinations of employers, and that the bitterness and misery which are the immediate fruit of a state of war, are poorly compensated by the degree of improvement which comes to the workman in the end. Nor is there any true satisfaction in the policy of restricting production, which is part of the present scheme. A system that encourages men to work slowly, and deprives them of all pleasure in the work they do, cannot be a sound one. If it increases the material benefit to the workman, it damages his moral nature; and where these are pitted against one another, it is not difficult to see what the net result must be. Nor is it for the benefit of the workman to appear as the disturber of industry, especially when, by doing so, he becomes the occasion of some great public inconvenience. Working men lose ground when they create a public sentiment that they are unreasonable, disobliging, and tyrannical.

There is no reason to expect that either trades' unions or combinations of masters will speedily pass away; our hope is, that on both sides there will come to be more consideration, more trust, more reasonableness in trying to adjust their mutual interests. Courts of conciliation have been proposed, and some good has occasionally come out of such measures, but they have not secured general approval and confidence as *the* remedy. Schemes of co-operation have been suggested, as harmonising the interests of capital and labour, by making the same persons employers and employed at once, and so removing all occasions of collision. We have never doubted that this is a sound idea, but we have been rather disappointed at the smallness of the practical results to which it has led. No doubt, co-operative schemes of distribution have done well, like the Pioneers of Rochdale; but co-operative schemes of production have not been equally successful. But, until success is attained in this latter department, the principle of co-operation will not have gone far to solve the difficulty. We do not despair of greater success in this direction. The working classes have much to learn as managers, and as critics of the management of their fellows. They are apt to be jealous of one another, and jealousy breeds discord, and discord breeds disrepute, and under disrepute the scheme collapses. This has been the history of too many excellent schemes. We believe that knowledge of the world and experience of mankind, joined to good sense and Christian feeling, will in the end contribute to lessen the difficulties that have often been experienced, and to make co-operation a feasible, though not by any means a universal, remedy for present evils.

II.

If there be nothing very definite in the schemes of social reformation, prevalent among the working classes of Great Britain at the present time, so neither is there much that is definite in their relation, as a body, to religion. Among their leaders, some like Mr. Potter and Mr. Arch are religious men; others, like Mr. Bradlaugh, are atheists. Of the working classes themselves, especially in Scotland and Ireland, a large proportion form the strength and sinews of Christian congregations. The old feeling is not extinct that religion is a personal matter between God and a man's conscience, and that its claims ought not for a moment to be subordinated to those of financial benefit or social progress. Among the working classes, too, there is a large number of quiet, unambitious men and women, who do not trouble themselves much with social systems and political constitutions, but simply try to make the best of things as they find them; who cultivate habits of diligence, sobriety, and self-control; and, in the affection of their families, the quiet intercourse of their friends, and the joys and hopes inspired by the Gospel, find that which is best fitted both to sweeten life and soothe its sorrows. On such persons, one looks with great respect and admiration; and the question is apt to arise, whether it was not a happier time when working people moved mostly on these lines, than when they came to think so earnestly of their social rights, and to struggle so hard to realise them.

There are two very opposite views of the bearing of religion on the interests of the working classes. In the first place, there is the view founded on the object of the Gospel, as designed to raise the fallen, succour the needy, rescue the oppressed, and cheer and brighten the lot of all who labour and are heavy laden. This is no accidental feature of Christianity. Our blessed Lord chose the hard working class as that to which He would Himself belong. And all His life, He indicated special sympathy with those who were lonely, friendless, and helpless. Some of the most beautiful of the prophecies of His coming into the world are those that foretold that He should "judge the poor of the people, He should save the children of the needy, and break in pieces the oppressor." Of all the aspects of Christianity, none is more conspicuous than its beneficent regard for the children of poverty and toil. It has anything but flattering words for the rich. It holds out no bait to secure their adherence. In a spiritual sense, it is a levelling religion—placing peer and peasant on the same footing as sinners, and offering them salvation on precisely the same terms. It has no upper chamber for the aristocracy in heaven. When Lazarus dies, he is carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom. Notwithstanding this, Christianity recognises existing social differences, while it sweetens them and makes them pleasant. It is no part of the object of Christianity to flatten everything out, to reduce all the diversities of society to a common level. The genius of Christianity

is social diversity with spiritual equality. The combination is very original and very remarkable. To induce men to bear patiently social depression when it comes to them, it dwells much on spiritual compensations — the blessing of God now, and the hope of glory hereafter.

Now, wherever working men are impressed with this friendly bearing of Christianity towards them, they accept it as by far their best friend and most valuable ally. They are thankful for its view of the worth of man, simply as man. They value its counsels to the rich, calling on them to act as stewards of the gifts of God, and they see in these the only force that can make the relation of the rich to the poor comfortable and happy. They accept with gratitude its bright representations of the future; and, so far as they are personally concerned, they resign themselves with contentment to their lot, believing that all things are working together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose.

But this very way of viewing things is looked on askance by others. They are afraid that, if Christianity makes people so contented, they will never be roused to fight and struggle for their secular rights,—for their fair share of the good things of this life. They will accept the tyranny of capital,—they will bow their heads meekly to the agricultural yoke. They believe the influence of Christianity to be too passive, too sedative. It makes too little of the present life. It does not strike hard enough at the causes of what is wrong. The philosophic doctrine of materialism goes with its whole force to foster this view, and is fitted to become, in the end, an insurrectionary element. If this life is the only life, there is nothing to make the miseries of the poor endurable. Besides this consideration, serving to alienate the working class from Christianity, there is often an impression that religion is more a luxury for the rich than a blessing for the poor; that wealth is unduly exalted in our Churches; and that the clergy prefer the society of the rich, and are often but little in sympathy with those who eat their bread in the sweat of their brow. In fact, we are told that if Christianity be practically in favour of the struggling and heavy-laden classes, it is not so in fact in the England of the present day. The feeling is stronger in England than in Scotland, because England has a far wealthier Church, and with some of its clergy peers of the realm, dwelling in splendid palaces, it affords greater facilities for a contrast with the simple, modest religion of Jesus and His apostles. On the other hand, the bishops have of late been working so hard that the prejudice against them would have greatly abated, but for such unfortunate remarks as that of one of them who proposed that Mr. Arch should be ducked in the pond.

There is reason to fear that these views have been spreading among the working classes, so that, even in Scotland, there is now a considerable proportion of them who have thrown off all profession of religion, and all belief in a life to come.

III.

In dealing with this state of things, the Christian Church has a difficult part. In the first place, there is a general feeling that Churches should have as little to do as possible with what is generally understood by politics. And, no doubt, this is a sound feeling. In the ordinary sense of the term, politics are secularising; and ministers of the Gospel, who constitute themselves political tribunes of the people, do not generally stand very high as ambassadors for Christ. Yet, on the other hand, the questions that affect the welfare of the working class bring us to the very edge of the political sphere; and it is a very difficult thing for any one, who thinks that labour has not yet got its due place in the body politic, to avoid the imputation of making himself a party man. In the case of a Christian minister who has this conviction, the remedy is, to keep his temper calm, and to occupy such an elevated platform as shall make it difficult to ascribe to him mere political aims. We should say, for example, that the late Dr. Arnold of Rugby, and the late Canon Kingsley, found the true attitude and position, as Christian ministers, for helping the working man even in the political sphere.

In fact, a Christian Church, or a Christian minister, will find the problem more than half solved, when he shows that he has a true sympathy for the children of toil. Some men are apt to let out how little they have of such sympathy, at the very moment when they fancy they are proving the reverse. At some meeting consisting of working people, they try to conciliate their good opinion by saying that they too are working men, and that working with the head is harder and more important labour than working with the hands. True; and yet instead of a bond of brotherhood between them, the remark has rather been a cause of separation. For, what the working classes, as we call them, feel to be peculiar to them is, that their work is physical work. It is this that makes the difference, and it is this that, as they think, causes the degradation. For my own part, I would never try to make a working man—let me say a collier—suppose that I regarded his lot as not much worse, on the whole, than mine. Honesty is the best policy. It is better to own frankly that his lot is a much harder one than the lot of the middle and upper classes. We should own cordially that it has many drawbacks from which ours is exempted. Now, this frank acknowledgment may easily become the basis of a true sympathy. We may proceed to show, that, feeling for him as one who has the largest share of the burden, and the least share of the refreshments of life, we would fain see him in a better position. Such sympathy from one in a higher position is often the sweeter that it is not often found in those who have risen from the workman's ranks. On the other hand, sympathy from those who have risen, and whose hearts are still fresh and tender towards their old friends, leads to something like hero-worship. There are three Scotchmen

who, having themselves once been working men, and risen to higher positions, have shown their hearts unchanged and their sympathies as tender as ever, and have accordingly become the idols of their countrymen—Robert Burns, Hugh Miller, and David Livingstone. No working man could have been an hour in their company without feeling that they knew and entered into the peculiar difficulties and trials of the class, and sincerely desired to help them to overcome them.

In the ordinary procedure of the Christian Church, there seems to be a lack of this sympathy. There is but little recognition of the reasonableness of the feeling that in this country, labour, or at least the labourer, ought not to hold so low a position—might be counted, when true and honest, among those who deserve well of their country. Some, indeed, say that this would be pernicious—that the labourer is already spoiled by flattery of that sort—that he thinks too much of himself—that he is giving himself airs—is making himself intolerable, and that what he needs is to be kept down. But has not this, so far as it is true, arisen, in a large degree, from the want of the true sympathetic spirit; and are not such men as Dr. Arnold and Canon Kingsley the kind of men who, if their views were more generally accepted, would keep down what is now offensive in the tone of the working class? The uncomfortable feeling now prevailing would certainly not have reached its height, had more sympathy for the working class been shown, thirty or forty years ago, by the clergy and other Christian men—at the time when they began to feel so keenly that neither was their service duly considered, nor their toil adequately remunerated.

There are many undertakings, having an obvious bearing on the welfare of the working classes, which, as all must feel, the Christian Church ought to encourage and countenance. The temperance movement, the erection of better dwelling-houses, coffee-rooms, colportage, education,—especially the higher education in its relation to the poorer classes,—may most suitably and advantageously have the active countenance of Christian ministers, and even of the Christian Church. On the other hand, schemes for turning the Lord's Day into a day of public amusement or recreation, ought not only to receive no countenance, but to be positively opposed. The small, but short-sighted class of avowed Secularists will, no doubt, stand up for a secularised Sabbath. But intelligent working men, especially in Scotland, will be pretty sure to take Hugh Miller's view of that matter. They will see that, the more the idea is countenanced that the Sabbath may be taken by the Legislature and devoted to purposes of recreation, the more difficult will it be to secure that it shall not be devoted to purposes of work. The inviolability of the Sabbath, as a day of rest, lies in the recognition of its Divine authority. The Continental Sabbath may have some attractive aspects; but, along with open galleries and open theatres, you have open yards and building stances. It is a silly plea, that it would be better to have open museums than open public-houses. It is not the friends of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

the Sabbath that promote the open public-house. Nor is it by opening the one that we may reasonably hope to close the other.

It will not do, if the Christian Church is to retain a hold on the working class, to pooh-pooh the whole labour movement, and preach up simply the old order of things. Of course, those who conscientiously believe that there is no justification whatever for the present efforts of labour to secure for itself a better place in the body politic, have nothing better than this to do, and must be left to do it. But, if it be the honest conviction that labour hitherto has been unduly depressed—that more account ought to be taken of the services of those who keep the community supplied with the prime necessities of life, or otherwise minister to their wants—and that efforts should be made, on a Christian basis, to help them on; then no prejudice, and no dread of being misunderstood, ought to restrain honest Christian men from taking this course. Churches are so apt to be afraid of offending the rich. It seems such a heresy that the rich should in any case be in the wrong. There is so much vulgarity and roughness about working people. Any one supporting the working class in a conflict with the middle class is so liable to be counted an anarchist, a republican, a firebrand. Prejudice is still a strong force, and is always at hand for any needed mischief. But true Christian nobility lies in disregarding prejudice, and being willing to incur the imputation of vulgarity, and much worse things, wherever the claims of justice and humanity are on the other side.

The true elevation of the working class can never be the result of any mere material arrangement or external scheme of social reform. The working class must be themselves estimable if they are to secure esteem. It is all very well to say that labour should enjoy more esteem than it does. To say that, and to prove it into the bargain, will not secure its being realised. To turn a good theory into good fact is one of the highest problems in every department of life. That a large proportion of the working classes are most estimable, we cordially allow. But it is otherwise with many. There are three great virtues in which, as a rule, the class must excel, if it is ever to enjoy its own—self-respect, self-control, and self-reliance. Of the three, self-control is the chief. The want of it is the cause of a great part of the sorrows and difficulties of the labouring class. When they have heaps of money, they are liable to squander it. When time is abundant, a certain person finds some mischief for idle hands to do. When liquor is plentiful, Bacchus becomes the only god. When the temper is roused, rough words rush to the tongue. The checks which self-respect and courtesy impose, in other circles, to the ebullitions of excited feeling, are little known among them. Living much in the public view, their vices are obtruded upon the public notice. Their drunkenness and their disorders have a coarseness of aspect that disgusts and repels. The true friends of their order would need to make something like a league against all their besetting

sins. And where, save in Christianity, will be found the power that can form all this self-respect, self-control, and self-reliance? The true elevation of the working class can only take place on Christian lines, because nowhere else can there be gendered the spirit which, by making them in the highest sense estimable, will secure for them the truest esteem. If working men become unbelievers, and turn their back on Christ and the Gospel, their way must be a way of darkness, and will never lead them to a Promised Land.

W. G. BLAIRIE.

THE PROFESSIONAL STUDIES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CLERGY IN SCOTLAND.

THE return of the season when our theological halls throw open their doors affords a favourable opportunity to advert to the subject of the professional training of our ministers. Two months ago, their appeared in this journal a general view of the method followed in the various Presbyterian Churches over the world; on the present occasion we confine ourselves to Scotland. In a suggestive paper "On the Professional Studies of the English Clergy," which appeared in the April number of the *Contemporary Review*, Dr. Littledale complained that, until recently, there was no practical or theoretical recognition, on the part of the Church of England, of the necessity of a professional training for her clergy. "It is within the recollection of elderly men, that, in their younger days, there was practically no professional training so much as procurable by the great majority of candidates for holy orders." Men entered on the greatest, the most absorbing, and the most responsible of all professions, with no professional training, and with a most inadequate sense of its duties and responsibilities. From this reproach Scotland is in a great measure free. The actual training given to students of theology has undoubtedly been far too meagre, and the deficiencies have been very patent. But, before the Scottish mind, there has ever floated a high ideal of what a minister ought to be, and of the training he ought to receive. The Scottish people have always insisted that their ministers should be men trained in all secular and in all sacred learning, and fitted, both by gifts and grace, for the high office to which they have been called. The Scottish Churches have done much to meet this high demand. As in all education, so in theological education specially, the high conception of John Knox has ever been before the mind of the Churches, always as a stimulus and often as a rebuke. It rebuked the Churches for their shortcomings, and yet held up before them something to aim at. And we find, from many Acts of Assembly, and from the efforts periodically put forth to raise the standard, and to increase the efficiency of theological training, what

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

a boon it was to Scotland and her Church, to have clearly before her mind the grand scheme of education set forth in the First Book of Discipline. It has ever been a kind of incarnate conscience for Scotland in educational matters. As a consequence, Scotland has never been satisfied with her actual attainments; she has felt under the necessity of pressing forward to loftier aims and higher results.

On turning to the First Book of Discipline, we find that, after providing for the due establishment of primary schools, grammar-schools, and universities, and duly arranging the order of studies proper to each, it thus provides:—"Item. In the third college, in the first class, one reader of the *Hebrew*, and one of the *Greek* tongue, who shall compleat the grammar thereof in three moneths, and the remanent of the yeare, the reader of the *Hebrew* shall interpret one book of Moses, or of the prophets or the Psalms, so that this course and class shall continue one year; the reader of the *Greek* shall interpret some book of Plato, together with some places of the New Testament, and shall compleat his course the same year. In the second class shall be two readers in *divinitie*—the one in the New Testament, the other in the Old, who shall compleat their course in five years; after which time, who shall be found by examination sufficient, they shall be graduate in *divinitie*." When we place alongside of this regulation the course of continued oversight and examination by the presbyteries of the Church, we see that, theoretically at least, ample provision was made for a thorough training for the work of the ministry. Before, however, students were allowed to begin the study of divinity, they had to be thoroughly trained and furnished in literature, science, and philosophy. In the following extract, no mention is made of Latin, for Latin was supposed to be so thoroughly mastered in the grammar school that it did not need to be mentioned in connection with university studies:—"Item. That none be admitted unto the classe and siege of divinitie, but he that shall have sufficient testimonials of his time well spent in Dialectick, Mathematicks, Physicks, Ethicks, Oeconomicks, and Politicks, and the Hebrew tongue, and of his docilitie in the Moral Philosophy, and the Hebrew tongue."

Such was the ideal of ministerial training set forth in the *First Book of Discipline*. But it was most imperfectly translated into fact. From many causes, the Church was unable to give to her students the training which she saw to be necessary. Theological chairs were suppressed for lack of funds. Incompetent teachers were often appointed, contrary to the will of the Church. The actual education given was too limited in extent, and what was taught was taught in an imperfect way. St. Andrews had four theological professors, the other universities had only three—viz., those of Hebrew, Church History, and Systematic Theology. The present curriculum in the universities was definitely arranged by the University Commissioners in 1861. An account of it will be given further on, but at present we are speaking of the meagreness of the theological instruction given to students fifty years ago.

There are many witnesses to testify how low theological education had fallen in Scotland half-a-century ago. No doubt, here and there an exceptionally good professor might be found, but generally, the statement of Mr. Arnot, as given in the following extract, is true. Students attended all the classes—Hebrew, Church history, and systematic theology—during all the four years of the course. They must have been most tedious years:—"In the Hebrew class the standard of excellence was not high. The teaching and the learning were superficial. Suddenly called to the office, without having time to prosecute those peculiar studies which are necessary for the efficient discharge of its duties, the professor was placed in a difficult position. Apparently distrusting himself, he could not inspire his pupils with confidence. It was dangerous to put questions where the answer elicited may lead the interrogator beyond his depth; and so the routine of the class was to the students very easy, but very dull. . . . In the ecclesiastical history class, there was no teaching and no examination. Lectures were read twice a-week, at which the students were compelled to attend, but in which they felt no interest. The only exercise prescribed and allowed was a prize-essay once a-year" (*Arnot's "Life of Halley,"* p. 18). This was substantially true of all the other Halls in connection with the Church of Scotland. But it is true no longer. In connection with the three leading Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, there are means of ministerial training which may be fairly described as adequate.

Let us here say one word on the smaller ecclesiastical bodies. In the Episcopal Church of Scotland, the candidate for holy orders must be a graduate of a Scottish, English, or Irish university, or must produce a certificate from a central Board of Examiners that he is duly qualified in the liberal arts. He must also "produce a certificate of having attended the usual course of the lectures of the Pantonian Professor of Theology, and of the Church's Professor of Ecclesiastical History, or a similar course, extending over a period of not less than two academical years at some university, or theological college connected with the Church, or any of the Churches in connection with it" (Canon x. 2). The course of study in the Theological College, Cumbræ, embraces the following books and subjects:—"Holy Scripture,—some book or books of the Old Testament, the New Testament in Greek, the criticism and interpretation of the New Testament; Doctrine,—the Thirty-nine Articles, Pearson on the Creed, Book V. of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Butler's Analogy, the Church Catechism; Ecclesiastical History,—the History of the Church for the first five centuries, the History of the Church of England, the History of the Church of Scotland; Prayer-Book,—Ancient and Modern Liturgies, the Rationale and Structure of the Prayer-Book, the Principles of Divine Service. Lectures are given throughout the year on some one or other of the writings of the early fathers. Instruction is also given in the composition of sermons, and in pastoral theology."

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

The defects of the scheme are obvious, and were so fully indicated by Dr. Littledale, in the article already alluded to, that we need not waste space in criticism. The time allowed is far too short ; and, in addition, the whole scheme may be dispensed with in Scotland, as in England, at the good pleasure of a bishop. This gives an element of uncertainty to the whole system of an Episcopal Church.

The professional training of the Congregational ministers is peculiar. After some experience in pastoral work, under the eye of the minister and congregation to which a young man belongs, he is sent, after approval, to the university. While pursuing his literary course, he is under the eye of the Professor of the Independent Hall, and has to appear before him once a-week. During the summer vacations, after completing his first year in Arts, he attends the theological classes, and completes his course both in arts and in theology in four years. The training in the Evangelical Union is somewhat similar, but we understand that they are at present engaged in re-arranging their course of study. In the Original Secession Church, students must have completed their Arts course before they begin their attendance at the Hall, and their divinity studies extend over four years. But, in all these bodies, the professional training is very defective, from various causes. The professor is weighted with the care of a congregation and the burden of pastoral work, and has neither time nor strength to discharge, in any adequate manner, the duties of a professor. The classes meet only in the summer, for a short session of two months. When these two circumstances are combined, they are fatal.

Looking, now, to the training of the larger Presbyterian Churches, who have organised halls and a staff of professors, set apart for exclusively professorial work, first, we may inquire what they demand from their students before they permit them to begin their professional studies ; we may then sketch these studies ; and finally, look at the defects of the curriculum on its scientific and on its practical side.

I. It may be observed, generally, that a degree in Arts, from any of the Scottish Universities, and from some others recognised by the several Churches, is accepted by all of them as sufficient proof that the students are qualified to begin their theological career. The universities whose degrees qualify for admission to the Hall, are those at which actual attendance is needed for graduation. Students who hold departmental certificates are exempted from examination in these departments. Non-graduates have to produce certificates of attendance at the university-classes of Latin, Greek, Logic, Moral Philosophy, Mathematics, and Natural Philosophy, and have to pass an examination in these subjects. These examinations are conducted by Boards or Examining Committees, appointed by each Church for the purpose. Every one who is admitted as a regular student at any of the Halls, must produce, to the professor, a certificate from the minister of the parish or congregation with which he is usually connected, bearing that his character is suitable to his views. He must also produce his diploma as

a graduate in Arts, or the certificate of the Examination Board, as proof that he has passed the entrance-examination prescribed by his Church. In addition, an Established Church student must pass an examination on New-Testament Greek, and on the elements of Hebrew Grammar; a Free Church student, in Hebrew and Scripture History; and a United Presbyterian student, in Bible Knowledge. The Established Church has substituted, in room of the former examination by presbyteries, the examination by a Synodic Committee, in the case of students entering the Hall for the first time; but the Free Church still maintains the presbyterial examination, and the United Presbyterian Church maintains it also, while limiting it to personal piety, character, and motives, with the elements of Christian doctrine.

There is no attempt, on the part of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, to imitate the Church of Rome, in withdrawing their students at an early age from contact with society. Rather, they insist that their future ministers shall share in the common life of the people; receive their early education in the common schools and grammar-schools of the country; obtain their literature, science, and philosophy side by side with others in the universities, and come to their professional training with minds, not dwarfed by a cloistered and antiquated view of the world, but thoroughly disciplined and trained in the liberal culture of university life. They do not undertake to train their students in literature, science, and philosophy; but before enrolling them as students of divinity, they ascertain that they have passed through, and profited by, a university curriculum.

It has ever been characteristic of the Presbyterian Church, that the pastors should be one in feeling, aim, and purpose with the people; and that the fellowship between pastor and people should be of the closest kind. One way of securing this most desirable end lies in the fact that, during all the years of youth and early manhood, the ministers of the Church have been of the people and with the people. Sharing the common life of the Christian family, breathing the common air of the country, moved with the emotions, aroused by the aspirations, influenced by the currents of thought of the people; taking part in the life and work of the congregation, and fed on the grand traditions of his Church, the future minister of the Church shares her life, and is kept close to the great heart of the Christian people. He knows them, not from without, but from within; for he has lived their life, and is, in truth, one of them. His is not the tradition or the training of an exclusive caste, that lives a life apart from the common interests of men; his early training and special culture fit him to give true and adequate expression to the life and thought of his people. While we speak of the professional training of the clergy, we also insist that one great part of that training is given in the life of the family and of the congregation; and the Presbyterian Churches have ever recognised, and, we trust, will ever recognise, this great fact.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

II. As regards the actual training given in the Halls of the Churches, it may be remarked that, with some differences, there is a general resemblance, both in the subjects which are taught, and in the order in which these subjects are taken. There is a difference as to the length of the curriculum. The length of the curriculum of the Established Church and of the United Presbyterian Church is three years, while that of the Free Church is four years. It is obvious that a different distribution of subjects will obtain, according as we fit them into the frame-work of a three or a four years' course. It will be admitted that a more thorough training can be given in four years than in three. And, without entering into details, as regards the differences between the various Churches, we shall indicate the subjects which they teach to their students. They all teach the sacred languages, Hebrew and Greek, and give two sessions, at least, to the literature and exegesis of the Old and New Testaments. Apologetics, Systematic Theology, Church History, and Pastoral Theology, have some time devoted to each of them. There are differences, in the various Halls, as to the order in which these are taken, and the time given to each of them, but all of them are recognised as forming part of the necessary instruction to be given to a student. It will conduce to clearness if we take the curriculum of the New College, Edinburgh, as confessedly the most perfect in Scotland. Readers of *The Catholic Presbyterian* will find it printed in the September number, p. 208. The course extends over four years; the order of study is graduated, and each year has its own appropriate work. The Church meets her students at the threshold of the Hall, and makes it her business to indoctrinate them with the Christian conception of God, of man, and of the world. She compares this with all opposing conceptions and theories, specially with those current at the time. The nature and the evidences of Christianity, the inspiration and canon of the sacred books, and all related questions, form the main theme of the Apologetic Chair. To this chair also falls the work of setting forth the arguments for Theism, and of examining critically the various naturalistic and antitheistic theories of the universe. Then, in the second and third years, she unfolds to her students, in systematic order, the contents of revelation, and expounds the doctrines of Scripture, specially in their bearing on the personal salvation and ultimate destiny of man; and, in the fourth year, she expounds the doctrines of Christianity—"with respect to the Church as an organised society, its character, properties, and objects; its worship, government, and discipline; the sacraments; and the ministry, with the duty of ministers." This is the main line of her teaching during the four years. In order to make this line as perfect as possible, the Church provides for the initiation of her students into the critical study of the Scriptures in the original languages. Two sessions are devoted to the study of Hebrew, and to the interpretation of the Old Testament. Two sessions are devoted to the study of the New Testament; and, in these classes, most of the questions, on introduction, exegesis, prophecy, and the relation

of the Old Testament to the New, receive a detailed examination. But it is necessary for her students to know how, in the past, Christian doctrine realised itself in Christian life; what doctrines the Church actually held at different periods; and what were the heresies, opinions, and practices which obtained in the history of the Church,—in short, what was the actual course of events and opinions in the Church; hence, two years are given to Church History. All this is fitted into the framework of a four years' course. And when one looks at what has to be done, and at the needs of our time, we cannot say that the course is one hour too long.

During his theological course, the student has to prepare and to deliver certain statutory discourses. These have been described in the article already referred to. In addition, there are many class-exercises, and written examinations in the various classes. It is well to remember that the students have to present, each year, a certificate from the Presbytery of the bounds, bearing that they have passed the examination for that year. The kind of examination, and its efficiency, depend on the Presbytery. It may be a severe and testing examination, or it may be merely nominal. At all events, there seems to be occasion for the Churches to review and to revise their legislation in this matter, and to adapt it better to existing circumstances.

We must notice one feature in the teaching at the United Presbyterian Hall which strikes us as of peculiar excellence. We allude to the chair of Practical Training. The course of lectures of this chair is admirably planned. The professor first reviews, in detail, the whole preliminary course of study prescribed by the Church, and shows how it bears on the equipment of the minister as a Christian man, and on the fulfilment of his work as a Christian teacher and pastor. The university-course is considered in its three divisions,—classical, physical, and philosophical. Next, the theological course is taken, and it is shown how each part should be brought to bear practically on ministerial work. The apologetics, exegesis, systematic theology, Church history, the Church as a society, and the work of the ministry as presented in the New Testament, are expounded with a direct reference to the work of the ministry. In fact, all the student's previous training is gone over, and sharpened with a view to direct ministerial efficiency.

The student, having thus passed through the years of his theological curriculum, next appears before the Examination Board, and is examined on all the subjects embraced in the curriculum. The examination is conducted by examiners who are not connected with the Halls. Before he can be taken on trials for license, he must present the certificate of the Examination Board, or Committee, to the Presbytery. When he has also passed the trials appointed by the Presbytery, he is duly licensed to preach the Gospel, and is eligible for a call by any congregation of the Church.

This is the ordinary course of training in our Scottish Presbyterian

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

Churches. While, as a rule, the Churches adhere with commendable tenacity to the rules they have themselves laid down, and to the course they have seen to be best, they hold themselves free, in special cases, to act in an exceptional way. The Supreme Courts may dispense, and sometimes have dispensed, with these rules, in the case of men of high natural abilities and exceptional gifts. If a man has approved himself in the home-mission field as singularly adapted for work of that kind, then the Church, through her Supreme Court, may set him apart to that work, though he has had no theological training. So also in other spheres of Christian work. While feeling herself called on to provide for the thorough equipment of her ministers in theological culture, she is ever ready to welcome unexpected gifts from the Head of the Church, and to receive, for His service, men whom she has not herself trained.

This rapid sketch of the actual training in our Presbyterian Halls will prove that we, in Scotland, compare favourably with the state of theological training in the Church of England as depicted by Dr. Little-dale. Our studies are better organised, more extensive, and more thorough; and the security taken that each minister shall have a certain amount of theological knowledge is more complete. Looking at the Presbyterian training in itself, and apart from comparisons with other Churches, there is much that yet remains to be done. Might there not be something like co-operation on the part of the Churches? Might there not be something like co-operation as far as regards the exit examination from the Halls? Might not the B.D. degree examination, which is at present open to all graduates who have completed their theological studies according to the curriculum demanded by their respective Churches, be so transformed as to become the common exit-examination for all the Presbyterian Churches? This, by mutual concession, ought not to be impossible.

III. We do not enter into a comparison of the merits or demerits of the curriculum of the various Churches. We take the New College curriculum as confessedly, in time and plan, relatively the most perfect. But, on the scientific side, there ought to be room found for a course of lectures on comparative religion. Students ought to be taught how to wield the comparative method, and ought to master the results won by that method. There is room for this course even in the Free Church curriculum, in connection with the chair of Apologetics and that of Evangelistic Theology; for comparative religion has now become an essential part of apologetics, and there could be no better equipment, on the scientific side, for the missionary to the heathen, than accurate knowledge of the religions of the world, and more specially of the religion of the people to which he is sent.

Another grave omission, on the scientific side, is the non-recognition of Christian ethics as part of the theological curriculum. In truth, this is a neglected department, not only in the Halls of Presbyterianism, but in Calvinistic literature. There is, however, a rich and varied literature

already extant on this subject, and the Churches ought to train their ministers in all the great questions connected with life and work opened up in this department: this, indeed, is indispensable, if she is to set before her people, in all its breadth and fulness, the Christian conception of the world. Room might easily be made for such a course, without displacing more important studies, and without unduly burdening the students. Nay, in Glasgow Free Church College, both these subjects—viz., comparative religion and Christian ethics—are already taught, and they might easily be extended to all the Halls of Scotland.

On the practical side, the United Presbyterian Church is in advance of all the Churches. She alone gives to her students what corresponds to hospital practice on the part of medical students. The Professor of Practical Training trains them in actual mission-work, both during winter and summer; while the presbyteries are instructed to examine the students on "the rules and forms of procedure in Church Courts," as practised in the United Presbyterian Church. In all the Halls, pains are taken to teach the student how to preach, how to compose a sermon, how to put the truth so as to arouse the conscience, to warn, to comfort and edify the Church. But most of the Churches leave their future ministers to pick up, as they may, the knowledge necessary for the right discharge of a large part of their ministerial work; for as soon as a young man is ordained as a minister, he has not only to preach the Gospel and to do all pastoral work, but he has to preside over the session, and to decide on many questions of Church discipline, ecclesiastical procedure, and practical administration. He has a seat in the presbytery, and a voice in the settlement of large, administrative, and judicial matters. Questions of doctrine, matters of discipline, matters involving the interests of particular congregations and of the Church at large, call on him for solution. And a young minister is usually ignorant of all guiding principles of church law and order. Would it not be well that, on the practical side, steps were taken to make our ministers acquainted with the ordinary principles of church administration, law, and procedure?

In all the Halls, a large discretion is given to the professors. They are chosen because of their eminence in their respective departments. They are free to choose their own method of presenting the truth. They settle the order of topics, the proportion of space and the amount of time they devote to each. Usually, a synopsis of the various courses of lectures is published in the calendars. The Established Church has little direct control over the professors,—though, indirectly, the wishes of the Church must exert a powerful influence over them. In the Free Church, the College Committee have large powers, and the Assembly appoint a special committee to visit each Hall every five years, to inquire into the working of the Hall, receive suggestions, and report. The United Presbyterian Committee on Theological Education are also entrusted with large powers.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

It ought to be mentioned that provision is made, in each of the Free Church Halls, for the teaching of natural science, specially in its relation to theology. This course of lectures is properly part of the work of the Hall on apologetics.

The object of our ministerial training in Scotland is, to give our students a competent acquaintance with all departments of theology, to store their minds with principles, and to give them such knowledge and such habits of thought, in relation to all the branches of theology, as to make it easy for them to attain to eminence in any branch for which they may have a special aptitude ;—this is the aim of our Scottish Theological Halls. And they have largely succeeded ; for, in our own day, they have filled our pulpits with ministers distinguished, some for preaching power, some for successful aggressive work, and some for profound and accurate theological thinking.

JAMES IVERACH.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN THE UNITED STATES.

IT is not the object of this article to discuss the utility of an Established Church, or to institute a comparison between the Established and the Voluntary systems. In an article in the April number of this Magazine, entitled "The Last Resort of Polygamy in the United States," the possibility of an establishment of religion in Utah, in case of its admission at this time into the Union, was suggested. This suggestion may have occasioned some surprise. If so, it may be interesting to know, first, what is the situation of this subject in the several States now constituting the United States of America.

What, then, is the present measure of religious liberty in these States, and what are the guarantees for its continuance ? The civil division known as the United States consists at this time of thirty-eight States, ten Territories, and the District of Columbia. The States have their separate State-governments, and are subject to the control of Congress only in respect to certain subjects affecting the general welfare. The Territories, on the other hand, are subject in all respects to the general Government. The States make and execute their own laws in regard to their own internal affairs. Congress legislates for the Territories. The States elect and remove their own officers. The Territories receive their officers from the same authority from which they receive their laws. The Territories are therefore practically in the position of minor children of the Republic, and their legal disability ceases only when they are emancipated from parental control, and enfranchised by an Act of Congress admitting them into the Union.

So long, then, as the Territorial condition continues, the provision of the constitution of the United States which prohibits Congress from

passing any law "respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," is a perfect security for the citizens of the Territory against an establishment of religion. When the Territorial condition ceases, by the admission of the Territory into the Union as a State, the protection afforded by that provision also ceases, and the citizens of the new State are left to protect themselves by the terms of the constitution which they may frame for their own government. Each of the thirty-eight States has its own written constitution, framed by a convention of delegates representing the people of the State, and then adopted, after full and free discussion, by a popular vote. In each of these constitutions will be found provisions relating to this subject. For convenience in examining them, they may be divided into three classes—

1st. Provisions asserting religious liberty, and prohibiting any legislative preference among sects or denominations.

2nd. Provisions like the above, with an additional clause of limitation intended to give a construction to the provision itself.

3rd. Provisions that prohibit all legislation intended to enforce attendance upon or support of religious worship, although applicable to all sects and denominations alike.

I. An example of the first class may be found in the constitution of the State of Alabama, in section 4 of the "Declaration of Rights," and is in these words: "That no religion shall be established by law; that no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect, denomination, or mode of worship." Very similar, in its legal effect, is this provision taken from the constitution of the State of Delaware: "No man shall or ought to be compelled to attend any religious worship, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of worship, or to the maintenance of any minister, against his own free will and consent. . . . Nor shall a preference be given to any religious society, denomination, or mode of worship." Much more brief, and perhaps equally comprehensive, is this provision from the constitution of Arkansas: "No preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment, denomination, or mode of worship above any other."

II. The earliest provision, belonging to the second class, that has fallen under our notice, is that found in the constitution of the State of Connecticut, adopted in 1818. It is in these words: "The exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall for ever be free to all persons in this State; *Provided* that the right hereby declared and established shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State." This *proviso* has found its way into several constitutions, among which may be mentioned those of the States of Florida, Mississippi, Missouri, Colorado, Nevada, California. The constitution of Colorado was adopted in 1876, and states the rule of construction in substantially the same words as those taken from the consti-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

tution of Connecticut. The provision is as follows: "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession or worship, without discrimination or preference, shall for ever hereafter be guaranteed; . . . but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace, or safety of the State." These provisions show the extreme caution exercised by the people of the several States in hedging their religious liberty about with safeguards against its abuse. Such caution is, in point of law, unnecessary; for the courts have defined religious liberty in a way that closes the doors against the danger of its being held to justify acts of immorality; but, notwithstanding these decisions, the people, especially since polygamy has drawn attention upon itself by its struggles for immunity, keep putting this limitation into their constitutions, as if determined to "make assurance doubly sure."

III. Of the third class, the constitution of Pennsylvania will afford a good example. It declares that "all men have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any minister, against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment or modes of worship." Substantially the same provision is found in the constitutions of Vermont, Wisconsin, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Michigan, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, New Hampshire, and several others. In the constitution of Iowa it is thus expressed: "The General Assembly shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor shall any person be compelled to attend any place of worship, pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for building or repairing places of worship, or the maintenance of any minister or ministry." Rhode Island has compressed this provision into the fewest words, as follows: "No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry, except in fulfilment of his own voluntary contract."

It is interesting to notice how soon illiberal restrictions, imposed by early charters and laws, gave way to the spirit of broad toleration and religious equality. In the charter for the settlement of New England, granted by James I. in 1620, is a provision which forcibly recalls the sanguinary struggles of those days; it requires all emigrants to New England to take the "Oath of Supremacy" before setting out. So also, in the charter for Massachusetts Bay, granted in 1691 by William and Mary, this characteristic declaration occurs: "Wee doe, by these presents, for us, our heires, and successors, grant, establish, and ordain, that forever hereafter there shall be a liberty of conscience allowed in the worship of God to all Christians (*except Papists*) inhabiting, or which shall inhabit or be resident within our said province." But in 1779, the people of Massachusetts framed, and in 1780 they adopted, by a

popular vote, a constitution from which the parenthetic clause just given was omitted, and religious liberty asserted in these words: "It is the right, as well as the duty, of all men in society, publicly and at stated seasons to worship the Supreme Being, the Great Creator and Preserver of the Universe; and no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained in his person, liberty, or estate for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, or for his religious profession or sentiments; *Provided* he doth not disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious worship." But more than one hundred years prior to this constitution, William Penn and his associates framed a body of laws for the government of the colony of Pennsylvania, which established religious liberty therein in this memorable declaration: "That all persons living in this province who confess and acknowledge the one Almighty and Eternal God to be the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the world, and that hold themselves obliged in conscience to live peaceably and justly in civil society, shall in no ways be molested or prejudiced for their religious persuasion or practice in matters of faith and worship, nor shall they be compelled at any time to frequent or maintain any religious worship, place, or ministry whatever." These are brave words for that age of strife and intolerance, and their influence has been felt outside of the old colonial limits. It was eminently fitting that, in a State where religious liberty was proclaimed and practised at so early and important a period, the Continental Congress should afterwards give to the world the famous "Declaration of Independence," with its clear assertion of civil and political liberty.

But that we may not too greatly extend this article, let us return to the questions with which we set out, viz., What is the measure of religious liberty in the United States? and, What are the guarantees for its continuance? To the first of these our reply is, that the measure of religious liberty in the United States is the *conscience of the individual worshipper*, subject only to the necessary limitation, that licentiousness, and practices that are inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State, are not to be tolerated. To the second question, our reply is, that the guarantees for religious liberty are found, for the people of the Territories and of the District of Columbia, in the constitution of the United States; and for the people of the several States, in the constitutions framed and adopted by themselves, and subject to modification at their pleasure.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS.

NOTES OF THE DAY.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF LARGE CITIES.

IF the meetings of the Social Science Association of Great Britain serve no other purpose, they at least draw attention to the increasing difficulties which the present arrangements of society create. The Bishop of Manchester, president of the recent meeting, dwelt much on the unfavourable conditions of life in our great manufacturing towns. Virtually, it is coming to this, that the rich dwell in separate towns from the poor, and that, in the towns of the poor, there are no persons of leisure and means to take a lead in anything that would tend to the general good. The houses are slight and insufficient, and the surroundings are dingy and repulsive. Instead of finding anything in their neighbourhood to revive and cheer their spirits, when they come out of the monotonous mill or the dingy workshop, working people find the same monotonous and dingy aspect everywhere, and the temptations to drinking, as a solace under their burdens, become overwhelming.

Our congregations, too, bear testimony to the change. At a time when the conviction is becoming stronger, that intercourse among rich and poor is essential to the welfare of both, and that rich congregations with nothing to do must come to rottenness, social changes are going on which are making some congregations more democratic and others more aristocratic than before. In cities, the text has become nearly obsolete, "The rich and the poor meet together: the Lord is the Maker of them all." In our fashionable suburbs, with no poor around them, people of leisure and means swarm; in our High Streets and old quarters generally, there are few or none but poor, and no persons of leisure and means. In America, we believe, the tendencies are similar. It is certainly not a wholesome state of things—and the question is, What is to be done?

It is a question on which we should like, above all things, to have the views of our Christian laymen of means and leisure. It is they, to a large extent, who are forming these new genteel suburbs. It is remarkable what a large proportion of quiet, Christian families are found residing there. It is impossible but that many of them, in removing to these new and inviting localities for the sake of their families, have often asked the question, What is our duty now to the poor whom we have left behind? We are no longer their neighbours literally,—are we to be their neighbours no longer in any sense? Is the mass of hard-wrought men and women to be left entirely to its own resources, looking with fresh bitterness across the gulf that separates them from the comfortable class, whose chief merit is that they have been more fortunate than themselves in the business of life?

We invite those who have pondered this question in a large and liberal spirit to offer their suggestions. It is no affectation, but the simple truth we utter, when we say that nothing could be more seasonable, or likely to be useful, than the matured views of our thoughtful Christian laymen on such a topic.

"WHAT SHALL WE EAT?"

This question is engaging the earnest attention of physicians and others in a sense which is quite legitimate; for it was in quite another view that our Lord bid us take no thought for the morrow, saying, What shall we eat, and what shall we drink? The question now is, What kind and amount of food is most fitted to promote the health and the strength of the eaters? People in Great Britain are remarking on the striking fact that, although the year 1879 has brought the most stormy and unpleasant weather within the memory of man, though trade has been depressed, and the number of the unemployed unexampled, yet the rate of mortality has been lower than for many previous years. It has been observed, too, that, in

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

workhouse infirmaries, the longevity of the inmates is much beyond what might have been looked for, considering that they belong to the class which is worst fed, worst clothed, and worst lodged. A surgeon in one of these infirmaries has published the remarkable fact that, when he withdrew beer and brandy, some thirty bed-ridden old women, who, owing to their feebleness, had had to be supplied largely with stimulants under the former regimen, regained a measure of vigour, and were able to move about as before. Many questions have been raised, both as to meat and drink, in their bearing on health and longevity. Without going into all these, we believe we may say that the verdict on the whole subject tends in this direction—that a moderate quantity of simple but wholesome food is best for the human frame. There seems no difference of medical opinion on the fact that, wherever food is very abundant, and is served richly and luxuriously, and people partake of it as freely as they choose, the health is liable to be injured. This remark applies to all classes of society; for, in very prosperous times, a luxuriously spread table is the temptation of some of the labouring, as well as the aristocratic classes, although, in the case of the former, the danger is more in the way of excessive drinking. It would seem, then, that the benefit to health, arising in these times from the restriction that necessity has imposed on those who formerly ate and drank too freely, is greater than the damage caused to those whom it has this year deprived of sufficient food. In fact, we seem to be coming round to the views of Daniel and his companions at Babylon, and to be finding that pulse to eat and water to drink make fairer countenances and stronger frames than a daily provision of the king's meat and of the wine which he drank.

EGYPT AND THE SLAVE-TRADE.

The events have been very surprising that of late years have turned Egypt against the slave-trade, the more especially because Mohammedans and slavery seem natural allies, and the influence of Mohammedanism might be expected to go in favour of the system. And so, we fear, it does. The repression of the slave-trade seems more a measure into which Egypt has been forced by pressure from without, than one which she has adopted from a hearty regard to her interests and her duty. If the conviction has to some extent influenced her, that, for her permanent and higher good, it would be better for her to abolish the slave-trade, and become like the Western nations, that conviction is not strong enough to overbear the strong temptation to resume a business which brings a certain immediate benefit to those who engage in it. Very disquieting, accordingly, has been the recent announcement, that Colonel Gordon, Governor-General of Soudan, is about to leave it, and that, on his departure, there will be no obstacle to the resumption of the slave-trade in all the vast region over which his influence extended. Even if Egypt were cordial in her opposition to the traffic, she has not power enough to suppress it over the great regions which she has recently claimed to govern. Apprehensions are entertained that the old atrocities will be renewed again. The friends of humanity will have to give renewed attention to the conflict, and remember—

"That freedom's battle once begun,
Though baffled oft, is ever won."

THE JESUITS IN CENTRAL AFRICA.

From information lately received, we learn that the Jesuits are endeavouring to establish a mission in Central Africa. A party of eleven appeared among the simple-minded Bamangwatos, in whose country agents of the London Missionary Society have for some years been at work. The natives were astonished at the arrival of so many new teachers, but especially wondered that these had no wives with them. Shortly after their arrival, a picture of Jesus on the cross, with two Zulus in the attitude of worship at the foot, was produced, and tied to the back

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

of a waggon ; but, though this drew a large crowd, it did not have the effect that was doubtless expected. "How did black people come there?" asked one. "I have always heard that Makhoa (white people) and Bayuda (Jews) crucified Jesus." "It is simply slander," said another ; "black people did *not* kill Him." Some of the missionaries shortly afterwards went to visit the chief, to whom they offered a breech-loading rifle as a present, but this was declined. Next day, by appointment, they obtained a longer interview, when the rifle was again pressed on his acceptance, but once more refused, with the remark that he did not accept presents from missionaries. They then began to explain that they wished to settle in his country, for the purpose of teaching him and his people. The chief, however, expressed himself quite satisfied with the teacher he had already. It was in vain that the Jesuits urged that one missionary was not enough ; it was in vain, too, that they had been armed with a strong letter of recommendation from Sir Bartle Frere, who, they pleaded, would be much gratified if they were allowed to settle. The chief would not reconsider his decision, and informed the new comers that an application, similar to theirs, had been made on behalf of the Paris Missionary Society, and refused. The fathers then attempted to prove that theirs was the only true Church, while that of the missionary now with him and his people was a false and apostate Church ; that their Bible, too, was the reliable one, and the Church to which they belonged was its only authoritative interpreter. But they failed to convince the chief, who said he was quite content with the Bible as already translated into Sechuana. After a few days, the new missionaries started for the Amantibili country.

One cannot but feel strongly indignant at the sneaking spirit displayed by these Romish emissaries, in seeking to trench upon ground already occupied, and in a measure prepared, though this is but a portion of their usual policy. We are, indeed, already too familiar with such tactics, even on the part of some Protestant sects among ourselves, whose invariable plan of action is, to seduce simple minds from other communions, rather than to undergo the toil necessary for obtaining success in missions among the outlying heathen. But, with the whole of Central Africa still to be civilised, and so much territory hitherto untrodden by the foot of any missionary, of any professedly Christian Church whatever, why did not these priests seek to break ground on new soil, where they might at least be more likely to have things all their own way ?

THE SABBATH CAUSE ON THE CONTINENT.

By Professor J. H. DE LAHARPE, D.D., *Geneva.*

EVERY ONE acquainted with the state of Continental manners and habits with regard to the observance of the Lord's day, must be aware of the extreme difficulty to be encountered by those who advocate its sanctification. The question is not simply one of degree ; in many cases, nay, in most, there is utter desecration, and the aim proposed must be the restoration of a long forgotten past. In fact, it is the urging of views and practice thoroughly at variance with the general customs of the people ; and when, as a result of the Evangelical Alliance meeting at Geneva in 1861, the subject of Sabbath observance was for the first time earnestly brought under consideration, the overtures of its promoters were frequently met with the decided and disheartening answer, "It is too late !"

But some Christians believed that it is never too late to honour the Lord God of all the earth, and that submission, however tardy, is preferable to persevering disobedience. These laid a willing hand to the plough, determined, with God's help, never to look backward. Foremost in their number is M. Alex. Lombard, the president. Originator of the Society, he soon became its centre, and has always been its most energetic and efficient promoter. Whether at home or abroad, in meetings of all sorts, in travels and embassies, addressing companies,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

statesmen, and Governments, he has shown himself equally ready with word and pen, fully devoted, without regard to labour or expense, for the good cause he has undertaken to uphold.

The Society's activity, developed in different ways since its origin, falls to be regarded under three heads—Extension of its organisation, practical application of its principle, and publications connected with its object.

And first, it has been the Society's constant endeavour to multiply Sunday committees as much as possible, in order to extend and strengthen its influence with a view to general results. It was felt that many weighty questions involved in the sanctification of the Lord's day, required, even for a preparatory elaboration, the efforts of all friends of the cause in Continental countries. Through God's blessing, some success has been obtained in that direction, and real sympathy has been awakened beyond the narrow limits of Switzerland—in Germany, France, Belgium, and elsewhere. Several associations in Great Britain have lent a willing help; and, encouraged by these first results, the different Societies finally agreed to form themselves into an "International Sunday Alliance," by means of which all efforts may be combined, while liberty of action remains entire for each in its particular field. The Alliance proposes holding, from time to time, every few years, a general meeting, or "Congress," for the transaction of common business and mutual understanding. The first Congress has recently been held at Berne, under the presidency of M. Lombard, who, in his opening address, dwelt mainly on the encouragements to persevere in the cause of Sabbath observance. Perhaps the most impressive speech was that of M. Réveillaud, of Versailles, who confessed that the Sabbath question was new to him, one to which he had given little attention before his conversion, and remarked that, strange to say, continental Protestants showed less interest in this question than Romanists. He urged that the Sabbath cause should be advocated on the broad principles of liberty. For, looking at the subject apart from the Divine command to sanctify the Sabbath, it was evident that a man's freedom and rights were infringed, if he is not allowed to rest one day in seven. The speaker adduced the testimony of Proudhon, the Socialist and Materialist, who argued for rest on one day in seven, not merely as the exact proportion necessary to preserve the balance of forces in nature, but as a bulwark against a grasping plutocracy, that would reduce working-men to little more than mere machines. The whole proceedings of the Congress were marked by a spirit of deep reverence that was quite refreshing.

In the application of its principles, the Society has always taken the view that, to become efficient, all participation must be willing, and absolutely voluntary; and that, where the duty of Sabbath observance is once felt and acknowledged, the determination of the means to be used in each case, for its fulfilment, should be left entirely to the judgment and personal zeal of each adherent. The Society suggests and points out modes of action in a variety of circumstances likely to occur, and abstains from all direct prescription of definite duty. Upon those terms, adhesions have been invited; in Geneva alone, where, a few years ago, the police regulations enforcing the keeping of the Lord's day were totally repealed, the number of favourable answers reached some thousands; other Swiss towns replied in like proportion. Shopkeepers were requested, by circular letters, to close their houses on Sundays; hundreds declared themselves willing to comply, and the greater part of them have actually complied. Without being very extensive, the movement is so far encouraging, and better things are hoped for in future. An agent is employed to look after building operations, and the like; through him, representations are addressed to builders and others, and it is satisfactory to record that, almost without an exception, such observations have been received courteously, and often with thanks.

The greatest amount of effort has hitherto been spent in seeking the stoppage of post-office and railway traffic. In both those services, and also in the military (drilling musters, &c.), wanton contempt of religious principle and liberty, and consequent breach of duty, perpetually occur. Not only are the rights of men,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

our equals before God, sacrificed to the selfish advantage or convenience of others, but even in the mere course of routine, much unnecessary labour is imposed, and might simply be removed, if it so pleased those who have the power. But there lies the difficulty. It is not always easy to create sympathy in such quarters; and where sympathy does not exist, excuses generally abound to colour a polite but peremptory denial.

In addition to those moral obstacles, others, not a few, of a material kind, likewise necessitate a considerable display of energy and perseverance. As, under the present development of civilisation and national intercourse, no country is independent of its neighbours, or can act for itself without respect to the interests of others, the Society was led to embrace a very wide field of operations, with a view to combined action by the States of western continental Europe, for a gradual and extensive reduction both of post-office work and railway labour on the Lord's day. It cannot be a matter of indifference for Christians, that those who most directly contribute to place us in possession of the great boon of rapid communication in so many forms, should be deprived, for our convenience, of one of their most sacred rights and most blessed privileges. The alliance now established, comprehending delegates from several nations and languages, is considered as likely to prove one of the chief means toward the removal of so grievous a wrong.

The principal mode of action, however, is, and must be, the press, the most effective of auxiliaries. It is only by constantly presenting the subject of Sabbath rest and sanctification, under all its aspects and in all its bearings, that a sufficient impression can be produced, and co-operation obtained on all sides, in a matter where no help, however slight, must be despised or neglected.

The Society has put forth about sixty publications, from the size of a fly-leaf or handbill to that of a small volume. The matter is mostly original; a few are written in German; the number of translations is very small. The number of sales has increased steadily and considerably in the course of the last nine years; from next to nothing in 1870, they have reached £57 in 1878, and, for the aggregate sales of the local and international organisations, £141. Newly formed committees, or other friends of the cause, frequently apply for a complete series of the Society's publications, which the Board is not always able to supply, a number of them being at present out of print. Such applications have come from the most various quarters,—from all parts of Europe, from Madrid to Stralsund and Russia.

The characteristic of these publications is, great variety in the choice of subjects and the method of exposition. While affirming the sanctification of the Lord's day as a principle of Christian duty, the Society accepts, and even claims, the aid of all who are willing, whatever be their motives. As, in a case of fire, the water from the pond is as welcome as the lively fluid of the brook, so, in the battle against this most extensive and corrupting evil of Sabbath desecration, no help should be despised. Religious, moral, social, and hygienic considerations have been handled by turns, and given out as subjects for prize essays. In some cases, these writings have been largely distributed; 40,000 copies of an appropriate tract were circulated at the last French Exhibition. The pay-day most suitable for working people, considering their temporal and religious interests, has been carefully studied, as the dangers of the too common practice of paying on Saturday nights are well known. The subject now selected for competition (in four languages—English, German, Italian, and French—the first prize being £80, possibly to be raised to £120) is, "The Importance of the Sunday Rest for Officials in the Public Services, and especially for Railway Servants." The last day for receiving essays is the 10th of next December; and the best essay, which must be of a popular and attractive character, is intended for wide circulation.

The foregoing sketch will suffice to give a general idea of the Society's operations. Other means of influence might be mentioned; meetings, sermons, lectures, petitions to Governments and legislative assemblies have been used, and, it is believed, not in vain. A frequently welcome mode of action is the supplying, by

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

means of subscriptions at reduced price to the "Famille" (a sort of *Sunday at Home*, published every Saturday at Lausanne), proper Sunday reading to the people on whose behalf the Society has been exerting its influence. This, also, is a progressive work; and this year, 192 officials have entered into the arrangement for themselves and households, viz., 101 in the post-office, 79 on the railways, and 12 of the police force.

It will now naturally be asked, As a fruit of so much labour, what progress has been achieved? A very distinct answer to that question would perhaps incur the risk of saying too much; but still, there can be adduced, as a testimony to the value of the results obtained, the gratitude of the many who have benefited by them. But those advantages are far from being sufficiently secured; in the present state of things, a great deal too much depends upon individual goodwill. Men placed at the head of the public services are mostly averse to concessions; and it is easy to conceive how many, and what kind of difficulties, that disposition can create. In the progress of its work, the Society has reached a point where resistance cannot be overcome without an appeal to, and a response from, public opinion. It is for the public, who best know their own interests, to declare distinctly that it is for their advantage that the day of rest shall not be disturbed by the gnawing cares and bewildering thoughts of business and the world. Such a success still remains distant, and in its prosecution many a disappointment has been experienced. But the Society knows the value of the words, "Try again," most of all when it is the glory of God that is concerned, and when they can themselves rest content with receiving from Him the words of comfort He gave to King David, "Thou didst well in that it was in thy heart" (2 Chron. vi. 8).

[Our readers will remember M. Réveillaud, whose address at Berne is referred to, as the writer of an eloquent and valuable paper in the first number of *The Catholic Presbyterian*. He is a recent and eminent example of a convert to Evangelical Protestantism, and is at present the editor of an influential weekly religious newspaper, *Le Signal*.—Ed. C.P.]

MISSION COLLEGES IN INDIA.

By Rev. Dr. T. J. NEWTON, *American Mission, Punjab.*

THE chief design of the Presbyterian Alliance, as we understand it, is to promote a larger degree of sympathy and mutual understanding among the various branches of the Presbyterian Church. If this end is realised, the first to reap its benefits will be the weak and struggling Churches of Europe. It is high time, indeed, that we of America and Britain extended our sympathies to them in a practical form.

The Catholic Presbyterian supplies us with the periodical information which alone is needed to deepen our interest in their welfare. Alongside, however, of these older historical Churches, we desire to find a place for those which, though of newer growth, none the less deserve our sympathy, and certainly demand our assistance fully to the same extent; we mean those which have come into existence, within the last sixty or seventy years, beyond the old limits of Christendom. In Egypt and Syria, in Persia and India, in Japan and China and Siam, in Africa and South America, Presbyterian Churches are taking root, and, in some instances, evincing a rapid growth. They have been planted by different denominations of Presbyterians, and by missionaries from various countries—British, American, Danish, German, and French.

Of course, we cannot but regret our divisions, but the Presbyterian Alliance is an expression of a widespread desire for unity. If the result be not an organic union of the different branches of the Church, we trust there will at least be some common missionary action. We should be glad to see, and indeed hope yet to see, all the missionary boards and committees of our individual Churches dissolved,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

and one central propaganda, located at Edinburgh, London, or other convenient locality, as the missionary executive committee of all the Reformed Churches.

But, to come to a point which is more immediately practicable, there is one ground of action in which we think the Presbyterian Catholic world may easily unite—that, namely, of education (higher education) in those countries where our various missionaries are located. We do not wish to discuss the merits of educational work in connection with our missions, nor is it proposed that the missions shall extend their work in this direction. On the contrary, such a plan would relieve the missionary boards of this burden, and enable them the more freely to devote their strength to work that is purely evangelistic.

Education, even if not an evangelistic agency—which we do not hold—is yet, as all must admit, a most indispensable means for maintaining our ground where we have secured a footing. This is so manifest that it hardly needs comment or illustration. It is very certain that the Anglican and Scottish Churches would not be what they are but for their universities. The main strength of our American Presbyterianism is its colleges and theological seminaries. The Jesuits have owed their influence to their schools. Robert College in Constantinople, the Presbyterian college at Beyrout in Syria, and the Free Church and Assembly's colleges at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, are all so many strongholds of Christianity in the midst of the enemy's territory.

Now, what we wish to press is this,—that this educational work, on which so much of the future interests of our Church depends, ought not to be left either to the chance private enterprise to which some of these colleges owe their existence—as that at Constantinople, for example—or to the efforts of missionary societies, burdened as these already are with their own more proper work. In some instances, these societies are able to establish schools and colleges; in others, where institutions of the kind are fully as much, if not more, required, neither the men nor the requisite funds are forthcoming.

Again, there are certain mission-fields occupied by Churches which could not begin to make an outlay on education; their strength is more than spent in maintaining their missionaries.

There are Churches also struggling against Romanism, as in Italy and Spain, which can barely maintain their ground, but which, in spite of all the disadvantages under which they labour, are working bravely for the extension of the Gospel. It is little that they can afford to spend on education; yet who would deny that a Presbyterian College, affording the best literary and theological training to its students, would be a ground of strength to these Churches, which would not only render them less assailable by their enemies, but give them an untold power of aggression? We sympathise with our brethren in these countries, and are fain to give them some occasional aid; yet what more substantial and abiding good could we do them, than by the establishment and maintenance of colleges in their midst?

With such institutions, again, as strongholds in the midst of our missions, we should have the less to fear from such offensive acts of aggression as we have been called on to hear of, from time to time, on the part of some of our very Romishly-inclined friends in India and elsewhere, and of which we have not very long since had an instance in the Zulu French Mission. (See *Catholic Presbyterian*, February, 1879.)

In reference to the character of missionary colleges, we would say that, while they are missionary in their design, and their professors should always be men who have a missionary spirit, yet it should always be borne in mind, that the only successful basis on which they can be maintained, just as all colleges, is that of a liberal endowment. Professors should not be expected to do their work on pay that would not tempt teachers of the same professional abilities and attainments at home. A liberal salary, and this alone, will secure the talent which is necessary. Teachers may be selected from every source, America, Britain, the Continent. Could not many worthy Christian men, eminently qualified to teach,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

be thus utilised in a sphere where their talents could be employed to the very best advantage for the Church?

As to the funds necessary for the liberal endowments of colleges wherever they may be needed, we ought not to take it for granted that there would be any difficulty in the matter, where all the Presbyterian Churches in the world are interested in the enterprise. When Christians realise,—as indeed they are doing in these days more than ever before,—that the gain of the Church in any part of the world whatsoever is their gain, liberality will not be wanting.

At any rate, we feel assured, that, if we fail to secure, by some such means as this, the ground we have won in Pagan, Muhammadan, and Roman Catholic countries, there are others who will readily take it from us.

P.S.—Since writing the above, we have read the communication of the Rev. Henry R. Duncan of Cordova, which speaks directly on this point. He says that a college is the great want. So greatly is the need of one felt that the Andalusian Presbytery has energetically undertaken to establish one at Cordova, though with very inadequate means at its command; and the writer calls for the prayers and assistance of his Presbyterian brethren in Great Britain, Ireland, the United States, and the Colonies. But see *Catholic Presbyterian* for August,—General Survey.

GENERAL SURVEY.

BELGIUM.

THE struggle of the Ultramontanes to retain their power only grows in fierceness and intensity. It is the recent Elementary Education Law which so displeases them; for this, they feel, is the severest blow that has, of late years, fallen on the Church of Rome in Belgium. Yet a disinterested looker-on would say the measure is most equitable; for, though it takes from the clergy the supreme control in secular education, it does not exclude religion from the State schools, as is alleged: clergy of all denominations are invited, and even urged, to make arrangements for giving religious instruction before or after, or even during school-hours. It is enough, however, for the bishops, that the management of secular instruction passes out of their hands into those of State officials; they cannot now manipulate the facts of history and science, in ordinary school-books, so as to uphold the pretensions and dogmas of the Papacy.

Bold and determined measures were adopted with the view of nullifying the arrangements of the State. The bishops met at Malines and passed the following resolutions:—

“1st. As regards Normal Schools, absolution is refused to all the teachers, and to all the pupils frequenting these establishments.

“2nd. The religious instruction given in lay schools is considered as schismatic; consequently, all the teachers who give this instruction incur excommunication.

“3rd. Absolution is refused to all lay teachers without distinction, even to those who abstain from giving religious instruction in the school.

“4th. As regards the children who frequent lay schools, they are to be considered as having acted without discernment, and as such, admitted *provisionally* to their first communion.”

It is generally believed, however, that the Pope has interfered to moderate the zeal of the Bishops, no *mandement* on the subject of these resolutions having appeared. On the other hand, the conduct of the clergy towards the teachers confirms the reality of the decisions taken at Malines, as will be seen by the following extract from a letter addressed by the priest-dean of Etalle to a school-master:—

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

"You cannot conscientiously give religious instruction, nor even make the children repeat the letter of the catechism. The instruction which you will continue to give without the ecclesiastical authority will be *unlawful and deeply guilty*. . . . I am going immediately to establish daily catechisings for all the children, and I will take no notice of those made in the official schools, except in the way of condemning them. You must understand that every schoolmaster who continues the *public instruction* of religion before and after school will be in rebellion against the Church, and consequently in a false position, religiously speaking."

The teachers in other parishes have been threatened in the same way. Near Arlon, schoolmistresses who refused to give up the communal school at the summons of the priest were forbidden by him, in the name of the Bishop, to teach the children to repeat any prayer or the catechism, and were told, that, if they did not leave the school, they would be excommunicated, and could not fulfil any of their religious duties.

But the actual result of these menaces must be exceedingly disappointing to the bishops, who, no doubt, expected so much from them; for, out of 7500 lay teachers, only 100 felt so terrified at the thought of excommunication that they resigned their positions in the common schools. Moreover, such extreme measures must only have the effect of weakening the influence they were intended to maintain. By asking too much, all the less will be obtained.

 SWITZERLAND.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE BASLE CONFERENCE.

By Rev. J. E. CARLYLE.

A NUMBER of important points discussed at Basle were necessarily omitted in our article of last month. We add now a few supplementary notes.

In the English section, the subjects of Christian union and the present state of religious liberty were both considered. Herr Vischer Sarasin, who presided, recalled some still older Christian relations of Basle to Britain than even the Reformation times.—German Switzerland had received the Gospel from Scottish and Irish missionaries, who prepared the way for the famous Anglo-Saxon Bonifacius. He also referred to Duraeus or Dury, probably a Scotchman, who had sought to promote unity betwixt Lutherans and Calvinists, and proposed that an Ecumenical Council should be held. The Rev. Prebendary Anderson, on the subject of Christian union as an evidence of the truth of Christianity, observed that, when Christians were agreed in fundamental points, there should be co-operation, even if they differed in non-essentials. Truth is placed, by the Master Himself, before any longing for mere external uniformity. Mr. Arthur read a paper on the same subject, representing Dr. Pope, who was absent from illness. Christian unity is a demonstration of the reality of our faith, but this unity does not rest upon any visible uniformity, but in our being animated by the same spirit of confession and zeal. It was the function of the Alliance to assert this. Mr. Arthur, for himself, deprecated territorial uniformity, and the parcelling out of the world among the missionary societies of different denominations. I confess, as regards this, I prefer the principle on which the missions act to Mr. Arthur's view. Dr. Rigg read an able and comprehensive paper on "The present state of religious liberty." In England and America, religious liberty of a most comprehensive character was allowed, but they must have patience with other nations advancing more slowly in this direction. On the Continent, Holland and Belgium were the most advanced in this direction. In Sweden, the peasants were themselves intolerant, but the law had finished by granting a certain liberty to dissenters. Denmark had shared in the same progress. In Switzerland, great liberty was enjoyed. In Italy, the Gospel was freer than even in France. Portugal was making some progress. In Spain, there had been some reaction from the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

religious liberty granted by the Spanish Republic, but there seemed reason to hope that these claims of Protestant Spaniards would be now more fully admitted. (I fear this is an opinion in which others, conversant with the state of religion in Spain, scarcely share.) In Germany, there was now a large measure of religious freedom, except in Bavaria, Saxony, and Mecklenburg, which were far from enjoying it. In Austria, there had also been some recent instances of intolerance. In France, there was important progress. He indicated that in Greece, religious liberty was less than in Turkey. As a representative of the Wesleyan body, he judged, from their experience, that there was a better understanding now among the European nations regarding the question of religious liberty, which would certainly, in the end, be recognised. The Rev. Mr. Conder read an interesting paper on the existence and functions of conscience in relation to civic and religious liberty.

In the absence of the Rev. Dr. Thompson, whose valuable Christian labours in Berlin have since indeed terminated in his regretted death, the paper drawn up by him was read by the Rev. Dr. Gilmore Brown, of New York. Dr. Thompson had been appointed by the American Board of Commissioners to draw up a memorial on the subject of Invasions of Religious Liberty, especially in Austria. The paper referred first to the enlargement and confirmation of religious liberty since the meeting of the Alliance in New York. This was notably true of Turkey, where greater toleration had been secured. But toleration simply conceded the liberty of existence—liberty assumed the natural right of every form of belief to exist without molestation. It meant not only liberty of confessions, but liberty of conscience. The Berlin Conference, in dealing with religion in Turkey, made this great advance from toleration to freedom. It is plain, however, that the battle for this is not yet practically fought out, either in Turkey or in Austria. They have both subscribed to the Treaty, yet scarcely recognise its full force. Religious liberty means freedom, on personal conviction, to renounce one faith for another, and it sanctions the principle of propagandism. The Memorial of Dr. Thompson pointed out especially how this was infringed in Austria. It admitted, indeed, of a member of one recognised faith passing over into another, but this is not absolute religious liberty. It conceded, also, a certain toleration for those religious organisations not legally recognised, if "contrary neither to law nor injurious to morals." The missionaries of the American Board had fancied that this secured liberty for their evangelistic work; and, for a time, those adhering to religious beliefs not recognised by the State were allowed to meet for worship. But latterly, through Ultramontane influences probably, this is no longer tolerated. It is now interpreted that those belonging to unrecognised confessions can hold only family worship, at which no stranger, not even a domestic of the family, can be allowed to be present. I am unable to enter into the details brought forward at the Conference. Native Austrian petitions were presented in support of it. The grievance applies not only to the American, but to other missionaries also labouring in Austria. Other aggressions on Protestantism and religious liberty have also been attempted. The subject engaged the deepest interest and sympathy of the Alliance. At one of its final meetings, it was decided, as noticed in last number, to send a deputation from the Alliance to the Austrian Government and Emperor. The unanimity of this decision was shown by the large assembly at the meeting, when it was proposed by all standing up to express their hearty support for the resolution, and their deep sympathy with their suffering Austrian brethren. There are difficulties still to be overcome of a formidable nature. Unfortunately, the Czecks, once the champions of religious freedom, are now under Ultramontane leading, and their influence at the Austrian Court is greatly increased since they have rallied to the Austrian Reichstag. Still, it may be hoped that the good sense of Austria will lead it to see the necessity of making this last concession to religious liberty. No effort, however, should be spared in pressing the claim.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

ITALY.

FLORENCE, September, 1879.

AN old Waldensian historian, Pierre Gilles, tells us that as early as the pre-reformation times, the *barbes*, or ministers of the Waldensian Church, used to meet in September for their Synod, and also for examining and ordaining young men for the ministry. Of late years, the old and venerable habit has been resumed by that Church; and, on the first of this month, its ministers and delegates met for their annual session, and inaugurated their Synod by ordaining to the ministry Sig. Enrico Bosio, a student of the theological school of Florence.

That meeting of all the ministers of the Waldensian Church is always a most interesting one, to themselves at least. Now that the field of the mission has extended so far, they arrive at La Tour from all parts of Italy; old schoolfellows meet again, and relate to each other the events and the experiences of another year; the private conversations and personal intercourse are, perhaps, as much fitted as the regular discussions in the Synod to send each man back to his work with renewed energy.

The Synod of this year has not been remarkable for any startling event, or for any "important question," but it has served to show, once more, the constant progress of the Church and all its different operations.

The seventeen parishes (including that of the *Rosario-Oriental* in South America), which form the Waldensian Church, properly so called, number now 11,958 members, with 4727 scholars in the day schools, and 2859 in the Sunday schools. The total sum contributed for divers objects amounted to 46,069.65 francs. The spiritual and temporal state of each of these churches was examined on the first day of the Synod, and several gave rise to useful observations. It is felt necessary to divide into two, some of the parishes which, either on account of the increase of their population, or the wide extent of space it occupies on the mountain-sides, are really unmanageable by a single man. Some of our ministers have as many as four services on a Sunday, beginning perhaps with a Sunday school at five in the morning in summer, in a distant part of their parish. For many, also, it is a whole day's journey to visit some of the distant hamlets of their parishes. At least two new parishes ought to be formed; but where are the means?

Perhaps that difficulty will be overcome some day soon; for one of the most interesting facts that came out at our Synod is the complete, and, to me, really unexpected success of the new fund which is being collected in order to increase the insufficient stipend of the pastors. *The Catholic Presbyterian*, in its issue for February, published a paper on that subject by Mr. D. MacLagan, containing statements perfectly true, which I have been able to verify again this summer. One of our ministers, the father of a thriving family of five children, showed me, figures in hand, that he has only between five and sixpence a-day to spend in clothing, feeding, and educating his family. "Happily for me," he added, smiling, "my children like nothing so well as potatoes." He makes his own bread, for baker's bread comes too expensive when it has to be brought from some distance; but as it takes him half-a-day's hard work to bake the bread, he makes it only once a fortnight.

I am happy to say that the Waldensian Christians are beginning to feel it is high time to come to the help of their pastors. Some months ago, an "Address to the Waldensian People" on this subject was issued by the lay members of the Table,—Signor Vola, an advocate, and Prof. Olivet,—and was favourably received everywhere. The same gentlemen afterwards visited most of the parishes, calling public meetings on the subject, explaining the wants of the ministers, and at the same time pointing out the delicacy they could not but feel in pleading their own cause. In all the parishes, local collecting-committees were formed, and these set to work, almost everywhere, with laudable zeal. Although the year has been a very bad one for all agricultural districts, the appeal was responded to with more

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

generosity than even the most sanguine expected, so that, at the meeting of the Synod, although the collection was nowhere completed, and in some places scarcely begun, the above-named gentlemen were enabled to report that a sum of more than one thousand pounds (English money) had been already subscribed, and for the most part actually paid. To that must be added a round sum of 40,000 francs, subscribed by a Waldensian banker in Turin, who does not wish his name to be mentioned, though every one knows it. If other Waldensians, that are perhaps even richer than he is, were to imitate his example, the fund would soon be complete; but in this, as in many other instances, the poor have shown themselves more generous than the rich. As I have said, subscriptions are still being received. Two of our richest parishes had not yet begun, and some will do more than they have already done.

To conclude this subject, I may mention here, that, among the foreign deputies present at the Synod was the Rev. Mr. Scott, a missionary of the Established Church of Scotland in Syria. He had come with a very cheering message from our old and esteemed friend, the Rev. Dr. Wm. Robertson, of Greyfriars, in Edinburgh, saying in substance that the collection for the new pastors' fund was begun in Scotland, and is progressing favourably; also, that Dean Stanley in England, and several influential friends in America, had promised to take up that cause in their respective countries. It is to be hoped, therefore, that our poor ministers will soon be able to attend more fully to their important spiritual duties, without being crushed down by the oppressive weight of temporal cares.

After a thorough examination of all the affairs connected with the home Church, the Synod turned its attention to that wide field of evangelisation which now extends from the Alps to the southern shores of Sicily. Here, the first feeling of the Assembly was that of warm and heartfelt gratitude to God for the abundant temporal blessings that He has showered down upon the work during the past twelve months. A year ago, the future looked anything but promising for the finances of our missionary exchequer. The great financial crisis in Scotland and America threatened to cut off our main supplies; and yet, not only has everything been provided for the maintenance, and even the extension, of the work, but in no other year has it been possible to acquire suitable places of worship for so many of our congregations as in this. Our indefatigable president was able to announce to the Synod, that not only were Verona and Guidizzolo provided for, but that Naples, Rome, and Milan also would soon have beautiful places of worship. In Naples, a building has been bought at a very moderate price, in the best position, near Toledo; it contains an old *oratorium*, capable of accommodating from two to three hundred people, a large hall above that, and rooms enough for schools, teacher's and minister's dwellings, &c. It is a remarkable coincidence that it was precisely in the hall above the *oratorium* that the Rev. M. Appia, now in Paris, began the Waldensian mission-work in Naples many years ago. In Rome, the Rev. Dr. Stewart has been able to obtain a site on the new Via Nazionale; and although there are some legal difficulties at present in the way, it is to be hoped that there will soon be erected a place of worship, which that venerable friend will then hand over to the Waldensian Church. But the most remarkable case of all is that of Milan; for here, we see, for the first time, an Italian municipality selling a building of its own, and an old Roman Catholic church into the bargain, to the Waldensian Committee of Evangelisation as such, knowing perfectly to what use it will be put. Many old churches have been turned into stables and storehouses in almost every town of Italy; but, to give up one to Protestant worship has hitherto been deemed, by local authorities, too great a desecration, and it has never been done except by indirect means. But the municipality of Milan has nobly overcome all narrow prejudices of the kind, and sold the old church of *San Giovanni in Conca* to the *Valdesi*; and the central government has fully sanctioned the bargain. It is indeed for us a great moral victory, and an important step in the way of real religious liberty. No wonder, then, that the Synod, at the very outset of examining the work of evangelisation during the past

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

year, should have felt impelled to suspend business for a moment, in order to offer to God a united and heartfelt prayer of thanksgiving.

The following comparative statistical prospect of the *missionary* work of the Waldensian Church during the last two years will prove that the good cause is slowly, but surely, progressing from year to year :—

	1877-78.	1878-79.		
Communicants,	2,530	2,813	Increase,	283
Regular hearers,	4,203	4,584	"	381
Occasional hearers,	15,323	15,379	"	58
Catechumens,	393	410	"	17
" for 1879-80,	...	342	"	...
Sunday-school pupils,	1,749	1,636	Decrease,	113
Day-school pupils,	1,840	1,684	"	156
Contributions,	Fr. 52,578-33	57,008-88	Increase,	4430-55

The decrease in the work-day and Sunday schools is explained by the fact, that one of the Sunday schools of Turin has been this year counted with those of the Valleys, and some of the day schools have had to be shut for different reasons. But, on all other points, the progress of the work is truly encouraging. I may add that there are now, in the *mission-field*, 40 constituted churches, 32 stations, and 78 places regularly visited and evangelised. The number of missionary agents, of different kinds, is 105.

I should not like to close this letter without paying a tribute of deep respect to the memory of one who has, for many years, unostentatiously, but with great constancy and perseverance, laboured in the field of Italian evangelisation,—I mean Mrs. Revel, the widow of Dr. Revel, the founder, and for many years the Principal, of our Theological College in Florence. She died in the Casa Salviati, on the 31st of July, in her seventy-second year. She has been very justly called the *mother of the students*, to whom her assistance and advice have always been of very great value. And we must not forget that she has been the helpmeet of the most remarkable man the Waldensian Church has produced in this century, accompanying him in his travels, entering with quiet energy into all his plans, and helping him, in many ways, to achieve them. After his death, she continued to reside in Casa Salviati, and to interest herself in the college, in our missionary schools at Florence, in the orphanage of La Tour, and in the work generally, receiving friends from a distance, and corresponding with them,—always kind, hospitable, and active in good works. Hers is a loss that cannot but be long felt by all those who have known and loved her.

I rejoice to say that seven, or perhaps even eight, new students are expected next week to begin their theological course in Florence. Including those of the two more advanced years that remain, we shall have the largest number yet in attendance since the college was opened.

A form of antagonism to the Gospel—I might even call it persecution—has but this week presented itself in Rome. It sometimes happens that only one or two members of a Roman Catholic family become evangelicals, and from that moment they are not unfrequently subjected to all kinds of annoyances by the other members of the family, urged on by the priests. In cases of sickness, and of approaching death, everything is done to shut out the Protestant minister, and to oblige the dying person to receive the priest instead. Some days ago, a member of Sig. Ribetti's congregation in Rome, Sig. Franceschi, who had been an evangelical for many years, fell dangerously ill. Sig. Ribetti was then in Piedmont, but was telegraphed for, and returned at once to Rome to visit him. He heard from the lips of the sick man himself, that his wife and a priest had so tormented him, that, to obtain some peace, he had submitted to take a crucifix, and had put it under the bed-clothes. But he bitterly repented having done so, openly confessed his faith in Jesus, and even signed a declaration, before two witnesses, that he was firmly decided to live and die an evangelical. Sig. Ribetti continued to

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

visit him, though not without opposition from the people of the house. The last time he went, he found Franceschi already unconscious; and the doctor, who was present, also said to him, "He is already half a corpse." That was on the Sunday morning, and Sig. Ribetti had to go away, to attend to his public duties. When he returned, he found the room of the sick man full of people; there was a priest, who had the impudence to declare that Franceschi, that half corpse, had recanted, and been received back into the bosom of the Church of Rome. In vain did Sig. Ribetti ask that the sick man himself should state the facts; even if Franceschi had not been past speaking, he would never have been allowed to go near the bed; he was even rudely thrust out of the room, amidst the clamours of all those present. Sig. Ribetti applied to the police, but could obtain no redress; he has now published a very able pamphlet on this subject, addressed to the Minister of the Interior; but I am afraid he will not be more successful in that quarter. Two days after, Franceschi died, and was interred with great pomp as a Roman Catholic,—the same who, a short time before, had kept careful watch against the priests, in order that a daughter-in-law of his, who also was an evangelical, might die undisturbed in her new faith. Such tricks (for I cannot call them by any other name) are very often played by the priests, but they do little harm in the end. In the present case, the excitement caused in Rome, through this occurrence, has drawn many new hearers to Sig. Ribetti's church.

The General Assembly of the Free Church of Italy is to meet in Florence next month. I hope to be able to give your readers some account of its proceedings.

Allow me to add to my former letter on the *Evangelical Italian Publication Society*, that it has all along received, and is still receiving, a great deal of help from the world-known *Religious Tract Society* of London. Our most widely-diffused periodicals are supported by that Society, through the one in Florence; and, in the same way, a large number of books and tracts have been published in Italian. Yet the Florence Society has its own life and work. Thanks are also due to the National Bible Society of Scotland, for allowing her colporteurs to sell our books and tracts, thereby enlarging very much the circle of their usefulness.

A. MEILLE.

TURKEY AND GREECE.

CONSTANTINOPLE, 24th September, 1879.

PERMIT me to revert to two subjects to which I referred in my last letter—the Albanian people, and the Spanish Jews of this country, as the objects of missionary effort. The Albanians have recently attracted a good deal of notice, in connection with the Greco-Turkish question as to the cession of those portions of Epirus and Thessaly, recommended by the Treaty of Berlin. Without at all trenching on political ground, a few statements, necessary for our purpose, may cast light on other aspects of this matter.

Passing by the question with what ancient race the Albanian people may, with greater or less probability, be identified, we find them, at the present day, divided, by name and race, into some four or more different clans, each having its respective dialectic varieties of the common Albanian language. But, in general, these may be reduced to two great divisions,—the Tosks, occupying the south, from the shores of the Gulf of Arta, but especially from about the latitude of Delvino, northward to Berat, over the whole breadth of the province,—and the Ghegs, occupying the rest of the country, from Berat to the frontier of Montenegro, on the north, and from the Hadriatic to the Servian and Macedonian frontiers on the east. These territories likewise mark the range of the two great dialects of the language: the Tosk and the Gheg, with the single exception, that the Albanians in the kingdom of Greece, as might be expected, speak the Tosk dialect. Half, or more than half, of the entire nation are Moslems; the Tosk Christians of the south adhere to the Greek Church, and have public worship in their churches in the Greek language; and in the north, the Gheg Christians, in the valleys of the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

Black and White Drins, adhere to the Greek Church of the Servian type, and use the ancient Slavic language in their church services; while those along the seaboard belong mostly to the Roman Catholic Church, and, of course, worship in the Latin language.

The above statement will help to explain a fact, both singular and deplorable, that the Albanian people, numbering, we should estimate, some three millions, may be said to be, to this day, without any written language or literature, except in so far as it has been provided for them by strangers; nay, there is no school in which the native language can be said to be properly taught. For the schools of the Moslems use the Turkish language, and teach Arabic and Persian only in the more advanced classes. The schools of the Tosk Christians are all under the direction of the Greek clergy appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, and are conducted entirely in Greek, to the utter exclusion of Albanian. In like manner, the eastern Gheg Christians are taught to read a little Servian or Bulgarian; and it is only in the schools of the Romanist Gheg Christians that we find, along with Italian as the predominant language of instruction, a slight attention paid to the vernacular Albanian, to the extent of teaching the pupils—only boys—to read a few prayers, the creed, &c., in a very imperfect system of orthography, and to write it for ordinary commercial correspondence. One historical book of some value has been printed in this way, and a grammar and dictionary of Albanian have been prepared by the Roman Propaganda for the use of the clergy; but the only books we could find, or hear of, as in circulation among the people, were a small part of Bellarmine's Catechism, and a brief collection of prayers. No wonder, then, that the Albanians are jibed by their Turkish rulers as the *Kitabsiz Arnaout*—the bookless Arnaouts! or even that the people themselves have, for the most part, acquiesced in this state of things; few, indeed, having sufficient intelligence to perceive the evils to which it gave rise, or energy, skill, or influence to discern and overcome the causes that perpetuated it. Let us glance at these.

The people being divided into at least three great religious denominations, antagonistic to each other, it is plain that the sentiment of national unity, strong as it is, has lacked, for five centuries, the sanction of the deepest feelings of human nature. Not only so, but it has been the constant aim of the Government, as well as of the occasionally powerful Pashas of Scodra and Joannina, to promote, to the utmost, the Moslem faith, in order thereby to procure a wider area for the conscription, and this, whether the soldiers were intended to strengthen the force of the empire at large, or to enable ambitious pashas to defy the authority of the Sultan. The Greek Patriarch and his Synod,—intent on Hellenising all the nationalities of the land, and thus forming them into a homogeneous population, with one faith and one language, as the means of restoring the glory of the Greek Empire and the Greek Church,—were quite satisfied with the slow progress of education through the medium of Greek schools, and preferred that the mass of the people should remain in ignorance, rather than that, by the teaching of the vernacular, their *grand idea* should be lost sight of—the very same policy that lost them both Roumania and Bulgaria. Rome, while jealously keeping the people in ignorance, did not find her interests opposed by a partial attention to the vernacular, so long as the people were kept in bigoted subjection to the Romish See; and it is under her sway alone that we find any trace of Albanian teaching. But, besides these strong proselytising agencies, there were other causes tending to perpetuate disunion and ignorance. The two dialects of the language, though closely allied, are nevertheless, from the prevalence of nasal sounds and consonantal changes in the Gheg, as compared with the Tosk, so dissimilar, practically, that a person speaking the one dialect will not understand the other, unless he have specially studied its peculiarities. And even the fact that the four religious sections of the nation employed four different alphabets—the Greek, Roman, Slavic or Cyrillic, and Arabic—was no small obstacle to united action, aggravated as it was by the circumstance that no one of these alphabets represents

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

completely the copious sounds of the Albanian language. These must have been formidable obstacles to united action, even before the Turkish conquest; and under its iron yoke, no one seems to have arisen with sufficient intelligence, influence, or patriotic energy to do anything for the moral or political consolidation of the nation. The chief bonds of union have, undoubtedly, been these:—the substantial identity of language; their domestic, patriarchal form of government, which is said still to possess considerable force in some districts, and to recognise no religious distinctions; the numerous and characteristic national proverbs; and lastly, their numerous traditional ballads, in which their military exploits, and especially the career of Scanderbeg, their great champion, are transmitted from one generation to another.

At the present time, when public attention is being directed to this people as it has seldom been before, and when a strong desire for the recognition of their unity, as a nation, has been put forth by some of them, it seems well to state the case plainly, and to enlist, if possible, public sympathy with what is really necessary and desirable in this movement.

The parties who are now most urgent for the recognition of Albanian nationality are the Moslems, and especially the Derebeys, or chieftains, along the valleys of the two Drins and the frontiers of Servia and Macedonia. Let us say at once, that, with scarcely an exception, these chieftains are the most execrable wretches in existence,—brave, indeed, as the tiger is brave, but with all his blood-thirstiness and insatiable rapacity. From information of the most reliable nature, and descending to the minutest details, I have no hesitation in charging these men with the perpetration, down almost to the present date, of the most atrocious murders, violations, robberies, and wanton destruction of the property of their Bulgarian and Servian Christian neighbours—information which was duly communicated to the proper quarter, but without securing the least redress. What these men understand by national self-government is, liberty to continue their lawless depredations, and to domineer, unchecked, over their miserable serfs and clansmen, even of their own nationality. Yet they demand some reasonable things,—such as, that the whole territory inhabited by the Albanian race should form one great political province of the Empire, and that the national language should be exalted to its proper place, and be not only taught in Government schools, all over the land, but made the official language in the courts of justice jointly with the Turkish; one alphabet to be used for both dialects, and for all classes and sects.

While admitting the desirability of having but one national alphabet, and anticipating its ultimate adoption, we do not believe the time for it has yet come, and therefore prefer to continue the use of a modified Greek alphabet for the Tosk, and of a similarly modified Roman alphabet for the Gheg dialect, as these are now used in the Scriptures published by the British and Foreign Bible Society. But what is urgently needed, in order to put these Scriptures into circulation, is the establishment of at least a few schools, especially female schools; and these might be of a migratory character, in order the sooner to overtake the nation. The establishment of such schools, with the Bible as the basis of instruction, need not be expected from either the Government, the Greek or the Romish Church, or the people themselves. If, then, this crisis in the history of the nation is to be taken advantage of, the work must be done by the benevolence of Protestant Christians, and should be done *now*. Besides the great and painful fact of the gross and palpable ignorance and barbarism of most of the people, there are two special reasons for immediate action—one, that the attention of the people is being directed to the subject of a national literature as it never was before; and the other, that a new and improved edition of the Tosk New Testament, accompanied with the modern Greek version, is now in the course of publication. The first Tosk edition of the New Testament was printed at Corfu, in 1828, under the care of the late excellent Rev. Isaac Lowndes, and is an exceedingly creditable performance. The edition consisted of 2000 copies, and a further supply was not

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

called for till 1858, when it was reprinted at Athens, but not with equal accuracy, also to the number of 2000 copies. That edition has, by more vigorous exertion, been disposed of in twenty years, and a new edition, in the improved orthography already introduced in the Psalms, and in the publications of the Religious Tract Society (London), is now in course of publication. The four Gospels and Acts have been published separately, and sold with encouraging success, though at a merely nominal price. Most of the people, however, are prejudiced against the Holy Scriptures, in any form, as being Protestant books; while, as to the Albanian version, they say they know the Albanian language already, and do not need to learn that; and that the language of their Church is the Greek. Too truly it is the Greek. Well do we remember worshipping once in the church at Elbassan in Central Albania in 1867. The church was crowded by an orderly, but, on the whole, a listless audience, arising from the fact that but a small fraction of the people understood Greek, in which the service was being conducted. However, after the reading of the Gospel, a priest proceeded to read a translation of it into Albanian; and instantly, as if by an electric shock, every head was raised, and every eye directed with eager attention to the reader, till he had finished his brief task, when all returned to their former listlessness. The females are wholly without education, and rarely understand anything but Albanian. If this nation, possessing, as it does, many noble characteristics, is ever to be raised from its degradation, it must be by the dissemination of the Word of God, and the promotion of Christian education in the vernacular. It is because I have been long conversant with these facts, and feel a deep interest in this people, that I have ventured to enter at such length into their circumstances. A few school-books we have, but they are of very little use without schools. On the other hand, were schools opened, we have the means to go forward and prepare one or two school-books more.

May we not appeal, through the pages of *The Catholic Presbyterian* for help towards an object in every way so desirable and necessary? When British Syrian schools have been established, and have conferred such blessings on the women of the Lebanon, why should not British Albanian schools be instituted, to remedy the still deeper degradation of the Arnauts? Byron has depicted their valour, their fidelity, and their ferocity; and travellers have described their white kilts, their tall and slender forms, and their curious traditions, or traced their ancient identity. It remains for the Christian to stretch out to them the hand of sympathy, and rescue them from the darkness and degradation of ages.

I have left myself only a few lines to refer to the Spanish Jews. I need hardly mention that this people, like their brethren everywhere, pay far more attention to reading the words of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, than to understanding the meaning of the sacred writers. From the Depot of the British and Foreign Bible Society, thousands of Hebrew Bibles had long gone forth every year, but had produced little apparent beneficial effect, while the Spanish version was comparatively neglected. That version, prepared by Rev. James Christie, A.M., of the Church of Scotland Mission, and embracing also the New Testament, is a vast improvement over its predecessor, which was an interlinear version, fitted only for teaching pupils the meaning of each Hebrew word, and hence, constantly used in the schools, but quite unfit for being read aloud in church, or in the family for edification. The new translation, being so entirely different from all that the Spanish Jew had been accustomed to, had at first, and still has, but a limited circulation. From the beginning of this year, however, a special effort has been made to circulate the Spanish version of both Old and New Testaments, and with no small success, more New Testaments having been sold, since then, than in any equal period for many years. Simultaneously with this, a somewhat greater amount of religious inquiry has been exhibited here; while, at Smyrna, the attendance at the weekly Spanish exposition of the prophets, in connection with the Church of Scotland Mission, has for a long time, on an average, been fifty. Old tracts, too, have been reprinted, and new ones are urgently called for. We

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1870.]

are glad that a Jewish convert has come to labour here among his own people ; but we cannot help expressing our deep regret at the final retirement from the mission of the Rev. James Christie, a man of piety, learning, and experience, at the very time when there is a loud call for both religious and educational works for this people. After ages of spiritual and intellectual bondage, there seem to be some faint signs of a desire for progress ; and it will depend on Christians whether that progress be mainly toward the truth, or toward utter infidelity.

I referred in my previous letter to the necessity of employing the press more largely in missionary operations among this people. This will be abundantly obvious when I mention that there is scarcely a town of any importance, either in European or Asiatic Turkey, that has not a colony of Spanish-speaking Jews, in some cases amounting to from 400 to 1000 families, or more. It is impossible to expect that a mission, or even a female school, could be planted in each of these colonies ; the proper mode of conducting a mission to these interesting exiles is, manifestly, that the missionary, or his helpers, should perform regular and frequent tours, in the course of which, as we know from experience, he would have ample opportunity for preaching Christ, and for selling books and tracts, or distributing them gratis. This process has long been successfully tried by Rev. F. G. Kleinheim, of the London Jews' Society, Bucharest, in Roumania, and it is equally necessary and practicable south of the Danube. Whilst we rejoice in the success of the Free Church Mission here among German-speaking Jews, we cannot forget that the Spanish Jews form the great Jewish field of Turkey, and we should like to see it occupied and worked to its full capacity. School-books and tracts, formerly prepared by the quondam Free Church Spanish Mission, are out of print, and are urgently called for, besides that entirely new ones are required. We cannot but hope that active steps will be taken to meet these wants.

It is interesting to mention that a proposal was made, some time ago, for a conference of all evangelical missionaries in the Turkish Empire, to be held in this city next year, or that following, in order to consider this very subject of the use of the press for the diffusion of religious knowledge, as well as other cognate topics. As yet, however, nothing has been decided regarding the conference. The subject is an extremely important one, and I shall take care to inform you of what may be resolved on.

ALEXANDER THOMSON.

CANADA.

CHURCH ACTION WITH REFERENCE TO INTEMPERANCE.

By Rev. W. REID, Toronto.

THE attention of the Presbyterian Churches in Canada was directed, at an early period, to the evils of intemperance, and the necessity of seeking to check its prevalence. Before 1844, when the Disruption took place in the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, we find several resolutions of Synod on the subject. The first was passed by the Synod of 1839, in the following terms :—"Whereas the prevalence of intemperance is productive of the most ruinous consequences to the best interests of society, greatly tending to the increase of crime, and to the frequent destruction of life and property, proving, moreover, a powerful hindrance to the successful preaching of the Gospel, by hardening the minds of many against its heavenly truths, and leading them away from the house of God ; the Synod enjoins all the ministers under its jurisdiction to preach on the subject, and to use such other means as they may judge necessary to check the progress of intemperance."

In 1841, the Synod again uttered its testimony on the subject. In the resolution adopted on this occasion, the Synod not only renewed its injunction to ministers, to warn their people frequently and faithfully of the dangers of intemperance, but exhorted them "to manifest such self-denial in regard to the use of intoxicating liquors, as may not only be a safeguard to themselves, but a salutary

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.

example to the world." Ministers were also exhorted "to bring the subject before the Legislature, should the existing law be found insufficient to check the enormity of the evil, in order that such amendment of the law may be obtained as shall render it a bulwark against this vice."

After 1844, resolutions were passed, from time to time, by the Supreme Courts of both sections of the Church. In 1846, the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, after referring to the evils of intemperance, and the increase of the vice, "enjoined all its members to discourage, by their influence and example, the ordinary use of intoxicating liquors, and those drinking usages which have so long proved the bane of society. The Synod further agree to enjoin all Presbyteries and Sessions to use their best endeavours to the same effect, in the exercise of faithful and scriptural discipline." The Synod also agreed to issue a pastoral letter to the members of the Church on the subject.

In 1854, the Synod, in approving of an overture on the subject of intemperance, "agreed to adopt and advocate the practice of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks as a beverage, as essential to the full influence of the Church on the world, as well as on its own adherents." Although this resolution was adopted by the Synod, it is not to be presumed that all its members considered themselves as pledged to total abstinence; a very large proportion, however, of the ministers of the Church have been, and are now, total abstainers.

It is not necessary to give the resolutions which were passed, from time to time, on the subject. They were all of the same tenor, the only difference being that, in later years, greater prominence was given to the importance of legislation, with a view to the total prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks.

The United Presbyterian Synod, which united with the Presbyterian Church of Canada in 1861, forming the Canada Presbyterian Church, had from time to time given attention to the subject of intemperance, and passed resolutions of the same import as those given above.

The Canada Presbyterian Church, from 1861 to 1875, when the union of all the Presbyterian Churches was happily effected, passed resolutions, from year to year, and appointed committees on the subject of temperance, as did the several Churches in the Maritime Provinces.

Since 1875, the subject has received attention at almost every meeting of Assembly. We subjoin the resolution adopted at the Assembly of 1878: "The Assembly reiterates its testimony as to the enormous evils entailed by intemperance on the Church and on the world. The Assembly expresses satisfaction at the progress of legislation for the repression of these evils, and at the growth of a healthful temperance sentiment throughout the community. Further, the Assembly instructs Sessions to have continued regard to the causes and cure of intemperance within their respective bounds, and recommends to the office-bearers and members of our Church generally to cultivate and exemplify the principles of Bible temperance."

Perhaps this resolution might lead those who read it to form too favourable an idea of the progress of legislation in Canada, for the repression of the evils of intemperance, and of the extent to which a healthful temperance sentiment prevails throughout the community. Undoubtedly a decided advance has been made within the last quarter of a century, both as respects sentiment and practice. But there are great dangers still surrounding the young, especially from the practice of *treating*. As to legislation, progress has also been made, and no party now can ignore the pressing importance of the subject. The Canada Temperance Act of 1878, which, to a certain extent, repeals and replaces what was called the Drinking Act, gives to the electors, in any city or county, the power of determining whether the sale of intoxicating drinks shall be allowed within the municipality or not. The vote is by ballot, and the decision so reached is unalterable for the period of three years. Where the law is adopted, provision is made for the obtaining of wine for sacramental use, and liquors for medicinal and manufacturing purposes. The law also closes public-houses from seven o'clock on Saturday evening till six

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

o'clock on Monday morning, and also at the hour of eleven on other nights of the week. But, however good and salutary legislation may be, it can only successfully advance with public opinion and sentiment; and the wisest course is, while seeking right legislation, to use all suitable means to educate the public mind, and develop correct views on this important question.

On the whole, perhaps, less has been done by the Presbyterian Church in Canada than might have been accomplished, and actually has been effected by some other Churches in other lands. But the ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church have taken a very active and influential part in all that has been done in the community for the advancement of temperance; and a large proportion of the ministers—probably from one-half to two-thirds—are total abstainers.

UNITED STATES.

AMERICAN ITEMS.

WE have, in these United States, a large number of the children of Israel—no fewer, it is reported, than three millions. Nearly all of these, as might be expected, reside within the large cities, such as New York, Chicago, Cincinnati, &c., where, as in other places, commerce draws to itself the greater number, some lines of business being monopolised by them. The meat trade of the States, for instance, is said to be entirely in the hands of the Jews, through the control they possess over the cattle markets of Chicago, the centre of the cattle trade in the country.

Socially, the Jews are a people within a people. There is plenty of business intercourse between them and the members of other religious denominations, but there is very little of a social character. Christians do not go to the social gatherings of the Jews, and Jews are not asked to the houses of Christians. An invisible, yet almost impassable line separates the races. This unavowed antagonism against the Jewish people is accounted for, by those who cherish it, by alleging that the Jews, as a whole, are pretentious, coarse, and vulgar, and that they are ever determined on getting an advantage over those with whom they have any dealings. Occasionally, this social estrangement shows itself in unexpected ways. Some two years ago, one of our most honoured and wealthy Jewish bankers was told by the proprietor of a Saratoga hotel, that, though he had been in the habit of going there for years, yet he would not be received any longer as a guest, and this on the avowed ground that he was a Jew. A great deal of angry feeling naturally followed this declaration, and since then the Jewish people have declined to patronise the dry-goods store of A. T. Stewart & Co., the proprietors of the hotel. This year, we have had on a small scale a repetition of this conduct. One of our most attractive sea-side hotels has declined to entertain Jewish families, and this on the ground that so many of that persuasion are unpleasant guests. Not a little indignation has been caused by this announcement, though many persons regard it as but an advertising trick to draw attention to the hotel. Yet, even supposing this to have been the object, the fact remains; and the fact reveals the existence of a certain feeling. In speaking of these things, our Jewish newspapers complain that, in his commentary on the book of Revelation, Professor Godet, of Neuchâtel, has spoken very harshly about them, while with Dr. Martensen, of Denmark, they are exceedingly angry.

We have lately had a meeting in our city of a "Hebrew Union" or Alliance, intended to bring about a close union of the different sections of the Jewish people, especially in works of benevolence. Our American Jew prides himself on two points—first, his toleration of theological differences; and secondly, his general benevolence. The Jewish community includes as many different sects or parties as does the Christian, but there are no dissensions on this account. Each Jew claims for himself liberty to think as he pleases, and grants an equal liberty to each of his co-religionists; hence a man may diverge very far from the creed of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

his neighbour, and still be in good standing as a Jew. At the extreme right, for instance, of the community, come the *Chasidim*, the pious Jews, represented in New York for the most part by the Polish Jews, the most ignorant and superstitious of the whole people—so illiterate, indeed, that the educated and refined Jews almost decline to acknowledge them as brethren. They are the lineal descendants of the Pharisees in their professions, and remind one, by their bigotry, of the most ignorant of the members of the Roman Catholic Church. The Old or Orthodox Jews, again, are the descendants chiefly of the Portuguese. These are extremely outspoken in their professed adherence to Talmudic Judaism, a profession, however, not always consistently maintained. They will urge, with a loyalty equal to that of the Rechabites of old, the importance of abiding by the traditions received from the Fathers, yet their own compliance with these traditions is very scant. The sanitary laws of Moses, for instance, respecting food, are openly and almost universally disregarded. Then come our Reformed Jews, the radical wing of which party has run off into simple Deism, if not much farther. Not quite so radical is the ground occupied by the great mass, though ordinary Christians would say that even these are abandoning everything hitherto considered distinctive of Judaism. They reject, for instance, the idea of ever returning to Palestine, and call that simply one of the fancies of the Christians. Why should they leave their native land, and go to a land with which they have no connection, and in which they have no interest? They reject the idea of a personal Messiah, either past or future; alleging, in the language of one of their rabbis, that "Israel, as a people, is the priest and Messiah of the whole human family;" while another says there is no authority in the Scriptures for the idea of a personal Messiah. What these denote by the term "Messiah" is simply a social condition—a condition that will be realised when the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men will be universally acknowledged. That state of affairs will be the advent of the Messiah; while, as to the Sabbath, they desire, not the abandoning of the seventh-day Sabbath, but the holding of a religious service on a week day—the eighth day—on the ground that at present a large majority of the Jews, men and women, owing to the demands of business, never enter a synagogue, and that, unless some such course be taken, the people will drift away from all religious belief. One of the more advanced of these reformers goes the length of saying, that the design of the Sabbatic institution will be secured by the setting apart, as a rest-period, not of one day in seven, but of a seventh portion of our time; and that, if the seventh part of each day be thus consecrated to God, the Sabbath appointment is fully honoured. Most of these reformers are of German origin, and use the German language in their services. By the ties of tradition and upbringing, they are attached to the positions and professions of the Orthodox, differing from them mainly in the outspokenness with which they advocate certain views which the Orthodox Jews disown—but practise.

At this recent convention, projects of benevolence chiefly occupied the attention of the members. The Sabbath question came once to the surface, when a hot discussion arose, terminated, however, by the not unfrequent device of passing a resolution so comprehensive that it pleased both parties, and may therefore be interpreted by either as may be preferred. As nearly all the present rabbis in this country have been imported, it was thought desirable that a Theological Seminary be established. The proposal was very heartily adopted, and Cincinnati fixed on as the location of this new school of the Prophets. It will be well worth while to take note of the theological result of this measure; for assuredly, judging from present indications, the Jewish people in this land will simply fall away into utter unbelief of all revealed truth, in place of which they will substitute social morality and benevolence. Standing on this ground, the Jews are great supporters of Freemasonry, an institution in which human excellence and goodness occupy the place of evangelical Christianity. Among the other measures considered by the convention was the propriety of forming a "Hebrew Colonisation Society," for the purpose of helping such as wish to become farmers to remove from our

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

cities to farming districts. Such a project has a very benevolent appearance, but I suspect it will not be much of a success. The thing has been tried before and failed, and there is no special reason why such failure should not be repeated.

It would hardly be fair, I suppose, that your side of the Atlantic should have a monopoly of discussion respecting the doctrines of the Church. A very shadowy ripple of such has lately passed over one of our Presbyteries, that of Wooster, in Ohio. As the Presbytery had the good sense not to act foolishly, some outsiders, who bear no great love to the Presbyterian Church or to its Calvinistic faith, have been trying to get up a discussion, apparently hoping that some unwise brethren would commit themselves, and trouble the Church. Very happily, all such efforts have been in vain, and the officious advisers have been compelled to subside. The facts are simply these: A Mr. Alcott asked his Presbytery whether a minister might preach an "unlimited" atonement, using this word to mean an atonement *that God intended for all men*, or whether he must preach a "limited" atonement, meaning one that was adapted for all men, was sufficient for all, was offered to all, but in the Divine mind not intended for all. "The question seems to be," he said, "does God or man limit the atonement in its application? Where lies the determining factor?" In place of engaging in a theological discussion with him,—possibly what Mr. A. wanted,—the Presbytery referred him to the Standards of the Church, and told him to preach according to them. This answer, Mr. Alcott, who is an Arminian of the extreme school, understood at once. He therefore asked to have his name removed from the roll of the Presbytery, and retired, not, alas! into the "silences" of which Carlyle speaks, but into the newspapers, where the Presbyterian Church can afford to leave him.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

THE CATECHISM OF 1647.

YOUR correspondent "M." in his inquiry, in a late number of *The Catholic Presbyterian*, about a Catechism published in 1647, has hardly given enough of information to show the interest connected with his question. As I had a copy of the book referred to in my hands a few days ago, and have also some curiosity as to its origin, allow me to set before your readers a few extracts from its pages. The book itself is a small duodecimo of 242 pages, covered with the pale brown thin leather so much used at the period of its issue. Its title, in full, reads, "A Short Treatise containing all the Principal Grounds of Christian Religion (*sic*), by way of Questions and Answers, very profitable for all Men, especially for Householders. The Thirteenth Impression. London: Printed for John Wright at the King's Head in the Old Baily, 1647." This is followed by a preface of two pages in length, consisting chiefly of an address to the reader on personal piety, and the importance of cultivating it. Then comes the treatise itself, in the form of question and answer, these being in old English type. Each of the principal words or clauses in each answer is numbered, and forms the basis of a *discursus* in explanation of the position therein advanced, while sometimes a number of sub-questions occur during each of these discussions. The latter are in ordinary type, and the whole book is very neatly and clearly printed, with remarkably few errata of any kind. That your readers may see for themselves how much the compilers of our Shorter Catechism used it, allow me to place, side by side, a few extracts from its pages, with corresponding passages from the Shorter Catechism, adding that, as the questions in this book are not numbered, and as there are several sub-questions between each of those I quote, my figures are used simply to facilitate reference:—

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

CATECHISM OF 1647.

1. What ought to be the chiefe and continuall care of every man in this life ?

Ans. To glorifie God, and save his soul.

2. Whence must wee take direction to attayne hereunto ?

Ans. Out of the Word of God alone.

3. What call you the Word of God ?

Ans. The Holy Scriptures immediately inspired, which is contained in the books of the Old and New Testament.

[Then there are found here several questions in defence of the Scriptures, as a rule of faith and practice.]

4. What doth the Scripture especially teach us ?

Ans. The saving knowledge of God and Jesus Christ.

[Sub-question—How do we prove that there is a God ?]

5. What is God ?

Ans. He is a Spirit having being of Himselfe. [In the exposition that comes under this head, we have the language, "God is a spiritual, invisible, immaterial substance," and then, "infinite, eternal, unchangeable," with several other attributes.]

6. How many Gods be there ?

Ans. Onely one God, and three persons, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost.

7. What are His [God's] properties ?

Ans. He is most wise, strong, good, gracious, just, mercifull, perfect, blessed, and glorious.

8. What are His [God's] works ?

Ans. They are three, decree, creation, and providence.

9. What is the decree ?

Ans. That whereby God hath from eternity set down with Himselfe whatsoever shall come to pass.

10. What is creation ?

Ans. That whereby God made all things of nothing in six days.

11. What is Providence ?

Ans. That whereby God doth preserve and govern all things with all their actions.

12. What was the sin he [man] did commit ?

Ans. The eating of the forbidden fruit.

WESTMINSTER CATECHISM.

1. What is the chief end of man ?

Ans. Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever.

2. What rule hath God given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him ?

Ans. The Word of God (which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments) is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him.

[This answer is a combination of the second and third on the other side.]

3. What do the Scriptures principally teach ?

Ans. The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man.

4. What is God ?

Ans. God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.

[This answer is largely a combination of the fifth and seventh on the other side.]

5. Are there more Gods than one ?

Ans. There is but one only, the living and true God.

6. How many persons are there in the Godhead ?

Ans. There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory.

7. What are the decrees of God ?

Ans. The decrees of God are His eternal purpose, according to the counsel of His will, whereby, for His own glory, He hath fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass.

9. What is the work of creation ?

Ans. The work of creation is God's making all things of nothing, by the word of His power, in the space of six days, and all very good.

11. What are God's works of Providence ?

Ans. God's works of Providence are His most holy, wise, and powerful, preserving and governing all His creatures and all their actions.

15. What was the sin whereby our first parents fell from the estate wherein they were created ?

Ans. The sin whereby our first parents fell from the estate wherein they were created was their eating the forbidden fruit.

The correspondence between the statements in the two columns above presented

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

to our readers is such as always exists between a first draft of a document and a revised and perfected copy. Between two such writings, there may be differences of topics, of arrangement, and of language, and yet a careful reader can see at a glance that the two are most closely connected. In this case, our inference, that the two books are thus related to each other, is confirmed by the dates of their publication. This early catechism was in its *thirteenth* impression, or edition, one year previous to the preparation of the Westminster Catechism. As a matter of necessity, some, if not all, of the members of that Assembly must have been well acquainted with it; and they seem not to have hesitated to draw on it for materials for their own later and improved work. What renders this yet the more manifest is the difference between the two books in their latter portions. So far as we have quoted, the books practically agree; but after this, they proceed on a different principle of construction, and pursue a different order; yet, even in these parts, there is such a sameness of topics as to indicate a knowledge, by the later writers, of the earlier book. The remainder of the early book has no such logical arrangement as appears in the Shorter Catechism. Immediately after the statement about man's sin, there follows in it a number of questions about the obtaining of salvation; then a series about the means of grace, in which the Lord's Prayer, as a model prayer, is mentioned, with a number of questions explanatory of its different petitions; then comes a series about the sacraments, in which baptism is described as "our engrafting into Christ, our communion with Him, and our entrance into the Church." Next, we have another series about the Scriptures, and the use to be made of them, both in the way of preaching, and of public and private reading, as a helpful means of grace, to which the compilers add holy fasting, holy feasting, and religious vows, as of use for the same end. Then follows the question, "What is the principal work of faith?" with the answer, "To purify the heart;" after which we have the question, "Wherein is the sum of the law contained?" followed by some practical questions about keeping the law, all ending with questions that refer to the final judgment and the future state of believers and of unbelievers.

In all this, it is plain that the purpose of the compilers of the early book was to furnish Christian people, "especially householders," with a book for their personal edification, rather than to send out to the world that which would be a symbol of faith. But this latter is the very thing that the Westminster divines intended; hence the scholastic order they have followed, the objective character borne by their work as a whole, and the great difference between the two books in their latter portions.

With regard to the authorship of this interesting book, we have no theory. It may have been written by some of the Puritan ministers, who, for the sake of giving it an opportunity of getting into Church circles, from which it would be excluded if its origin were known, suppressed their own names, "doing good by stealth;" but whoever was its writer, it is more than probable that Gillespie would be well acquainted with it. If so, the tradition which connects his name so prominently with the answer to the question, "What is God?" may have had this much foundation in fact—that, when leading in prayer, he, consciously or unconsciously, drew on the materials which this book gave him, for that address to God of which the opening sentence in that prayer is said to have consisted. Can any of your readers tell us who is regarded as the writer of this book, or under what circumstances it was given to the public? G.

PHILADELPHIA.